

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XVII.—No. 67

JULY, 1941

THE HEROES OF CHAPMAN'S HOMER

BY PHYLLIS B. BARTLETT

To anyone who has looked into Chapman's Homer, it will have been apparent that Chapman approached his translation with a possessive attitude. Feeling that he alone among his contemporaries had been directed by Homer's spirit to reveal the epics to his fellow countrymen, he moved through them, as it were, inspired by a divine guidance. One of his chief responsibilities was to make plain the excellent examples of human behaviour which Homer had set forth in his characters. It takes a little patience always to perceive, through the wealth of Elizabethan rhetoric in which these translations are cast, just how carefully and consistently Chapman built up his own concept of the Homeric exempla; but once shown separate and stark, they make a chapter of their own in the history of renaissance ethics.

Although the several heroes represent special virtues and vices, they do not fit into any particular symbolic scheme, for Chapman was not fundamentally interested in the allegorical interpretation of Homer. Always one can sense his own partialities which he would have assured us he shared with Homer himself—and most especially can we note a difference between his attitude toward the heroes of the *Iliad* and the hero of the *Odyssey*. As we watch him unfold his different Homeric characters, both by his interpretative translation and his accompanying notes, we see, I believe, that he looked on the *Iliad* platonically, on the *Odyssey* stoically. The question which he

seems always to ask regarding the characterizations in the *Iliad* is the old Socratic: 'Where better can you find such and such a man set forth?' The question which he asks when presenting the central character of the *Odyssey* is: 'Where can you find a more truly stoical man than Ulysses?' Chapman was deeply concerned with both these challenges. As a dramatist, he was interested in different kinds of men, even though he may not always have presented them very effectively; he was interested in their 'humours', in their virtues and vices. But as a human being in need of a faith, he was interested in Stoicism. Wherever he looked in Homer he found 'naked truths' about man's nature, human nature that comprehended both strength and weakness, good and bad. 'Nature and Homer were, he found, the same.'

The fable was Homer's vehicle for conveying these moral truths, but Chapman's response to his task shows him clearly more interested in that part of the story which reveals how men conduct themselves than in that which relates what they achieved. He indicates at every point of their conduct his own judgment of them and of how they are behaving; additional phrases or whole passages make certain the turn of his active judgment.

Achilles. The traditional conception of Achilles' character was, of course, that he typified bodily courage, was the ideal soldier. Chapman accepted this *cliché* and used it for the purpose of conventional flattery in the epistle addressed to Essex which accompanied the *Seauen Bookes of the Iliades* (1598). In this epistle Essex the soldier is identified with the hero of the *Iliad*. But that is not all. The qualities of a true soldier must be further analyzed, the mysteries of Homer explored. Chapman does this most explicitly in the lines which he adds to Achilles' address to Hector in the Twenty-Second Book.

Therefore now, all worth that fits a man
Call to thee, all particular parts that fit a soldier,
And they all this include (besides the skill and spirit of war)
Hunger for slaughter, and a hate that eats thy heart to eat
Thy foe's heart. This stirs, this supplies in death the killing heat;
And all this needst thou. (XXII, 230-5.)¹

But this hate which is absolutely imperative to the warrior in heat of battle is a passion governed by the will. On this point Chapman is

¹ Italics are used throughout this article to indicate Chapman's additions to Homer.

particularly insistent. Throughout he takes pains to rationalize the wrath of Achilles. In the early books, Achilles, in order to account for his initial hate, is made to analyze the transgressions of Agamemnon in the light of what a true king should be.¹ Later on, where we find him as most perfectly the warrior, the same process is gone through. In the Ninth Book he allows his anger to work itself up to the boiling point through the following rationalization.

But still as often as I think, how rudely I was us'd,
And, like a stranger, for all rites, fit for our good, refus'd,
My heart doth swell against the man, that durst be so profane
To violate his sacred place; not for my private bane,
But since wrackt vertue's generall laws he shameless did infringe;
For whose sake I will loose the reins, and give mine anger swinge,
Without my wisdom's least impeach. He is a fool, and base,
That pities vice-plagu'd minds, when pain, not love of right,
gives place. (IX, 612-9.)

His wrath, the theme of the epic, becomes in Chapman's translation a kind of bellows, managed with full self-consciousness according to the needs of every occasion. When the time comes for him to make his peace with Agamemnon and accept his gifts, Achilles again informs his audience that he is in full control of his passions and that the occasion now bids him deflate his anger.

*Tis for the senseless fire
Still to be burning, having stuff; but men must curb rage still,
Being fram'd with voluntary powers, as well to check the will
As give it reins. (XIX, 61-4.)*

Chapman's interest in Achilles did not go beyond this kind of analysis of his wrath. The notes tell the same tale; Achilles is scarcely ever mentioned.

And the notes throughout both Chapman's *Iliads* and *Odysseys* are a pretty sure indication of where Chapman's interests lie. Where he fails to point the moral and adorn the tale, we know that his own passions are dormant. Since he regarded all of Homer's heroes ethically instead of poetically, he failed to respond to the human warmth and variability of Achilles, so hard to fit into any strict ethical pattern unless one is prepared to take the big leap with Professor Stoll and accept him as exemplifying the highest of all virtues, magnanimity;² and in order to do that one must certainly have

¹ See my article, 'Chapman's Revisions in his *Iliads*', *ELH*, II, no. 2 (1935).

² Elmer Edgar Stoll, 'Art and Artifice in the "Iliad": or The Poetical Treatment of Character in Homer and Shakespeare', *ELH*, II, no. 4 (1935).

opened wide one's imagination to him. This Chapman failed to do, except perhaps once. It should be noted to the credit of his poetic insight that he was not shocked along with most of Homer's commentators by the lines in which Achilles enthusiastically exclaims to Patroclus that he wishes not a Greek or Trojan might be left alive, so that the two of them alone might have the joy of 'thundering down' the walls of Troy.¹ Chapman recognizes this hyperbolic expression as an intimacy between friends, and although he oddly calls it frolicsome instead of perceiving it as a supreme moment in Achilles' desire for glory, still he is independent and right in refusing morally to condemn Achilles for this outcry.

Hector. Hector, rather than Achilles, is the moral hero of Chapman's translation, but even Hector was not the real hero of Chapman's heart: that place was reserved for Ulysses. However, Hector was greatly to be preferred to Achilles. The two men are best shown in juxtaposition during the arrangements in Book XXII which preceded their final battle. We can see through the negotiations how the weight of the translator's approval fell to Hector. To quote H. B. Lathrop's analysis of the scene: 'Hector proposes to Achilles reciprocal vows before the gods that the victor in the impending conflict shall do no outrage to the body of the vanquished. He in abstract moral terms prays, "do not see a cruelty so foul inflicted on me" (XXII, 292-3) where Homer uses specific physical terms, "leave me not for the dogs of the Achaeans to devour by the ships"; in Chapman he begs, "to sacred fire turn thy profane decrees" (XXII, 295), where Homer has him beg, "give me my due of fire after my death." Chapman's additions give to the gods moral grounds for upholding vows:

. . . they being worthiest witnesses
Of all vows, *since they keep vows best*, before their Deities
Let vows of fit respect pass both. (XXII, 217-219.)

The refusal of Achilles is not alone stated, but formally condemned:

These fair and temp'rate terms
Far fled Achilles; his brows bent . . . (XXII, 222-3);

and Hector responds (XXII 307-10) with a reference to the common judgment of civilized men in terms which Plutarch would have understood, but which would have been meaningless to Homer:

I, knowing thee well, foresaw
Thy now tried tyranny, *nor hop'd for any other law,*
Of nature or of nations; and that fear forc'd much more
Than death my flight, which never touch'd at Hector's foot.

¹ XVI, 97f.

(Homer had said: "With full knowledge of thee do I look upon thee; I was not destin'd to persuade thee.")¹ Hector is here presented as an eminently civilized man, endowed with a sense of decent pious values which struck no answering chord in the heart of barbarous Achilles.

Chapman's interest in Hector was doubtless in part due to his feeling that here was a hero who, though not perfectly fulfilled, had fundamentally a stoical spirit. Hector could be reproved by his ally, Sarpedon, for failing in leadership, and could take the reproof to heart and act upon it. Sarpedon concludes his 'vaunt' by reproaching Hector for needing to be spurred to action.

'All this in thy free choice should fall.'

*This stung great Hector's heart; and yet, as every generous mind
Should silent bear a just reproof, and show what good they find
In worthy counsels, by their ends put into present deeds,
Not stomach nor be vainly sham'd; so Hector's spirit proceeds.*

(v, 487-91.)

A stoical spirit, yes, but unreliable, for after this description of Hector's generosity of mind, we may well be surprised to find him later, when Sarpedon is wounded and calls upon him to save his body, striding off to continue the fight with the Greeks.

*To all this Hector gives no word, but greedily he strives
With all speed to repell the Greeks, and shed in floods their lives,
And left Sarpedon; but what face soever he put on
Of following the common cause, he left this prince alone
For his particular grudge, because, so late, he was so plain
In his reproof before the host, and that did he retain;
How ever, for example sake, he would not shew it then,
And for his shame too, since twas just. (v, 696-703.)*

Thus, as a moral example, Hector had possibilities, but he cannot be depended on and pales before the enlightened morality of Ulysses.

Paris. I come to Paris next for the reason that the one scene in which Chapman treats him with particular attention is the meeting between him and Hector when Hector goes to his house to bring him forth to battle. In a way this scene sets forth with equal emphasis qualities of character which Chapman felt to be implicit in both the men: a bitter cunning in Hector, a quality which would not be expected from the presentations of him just quoted, and a self-

¹ H. B. Lathrop, *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman*, 1477-1620. 'University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature', xxxv (Madison, 1933), 288.

protective astuteness in Paris. In his translation of this scene he shifts the emphasis in an interesting fashion, whether from an initial misreading of the original, or from a wilfully independent desire to interpret, it is hard to say. Homer states that Hector found Paris in his chamber busy with his arms, *and* Helen sitting among her serving-women.¹ But Chapman explicitly states that Paris was sitting among the women. Thus the stage was set for the intricate deception which Hector was to practise on him.

He found his brother then

*Amongst the women, yet prepar'd to go amongst the men,
For in their chamber he was set, trimming his arms, his shield,
His eures, and was trying how his crooked bow would yield
To his straight arms. Amongst her maids was set the Argive Queen,
Commanding them in choicest works. When Hector's eye had seen
His brother thus accompanied, and that he could not bear
The very touching of his arms but where the women were,
And when the time so needed men, right cunningly he chid.
That he might do it bitterly, his cowardise he hid,
That simply made him so retir'd, beneath an anger, feign'd
In him by Hector, for the hate the citizens sustain'd
Against him, for the foil he took in their cause; and again,
For all their generall foils in his. So Hector seems to plain
Of his wrath to them, for their hate, and not his cowardise,*
As that were it that shelter'd him in his effeminacies,
And kept him, in that dangerous time, from their fit aid in fight;
For which he chid thus: 'Wretched man! so timeless is thy spite
That 'tis not honest; and their hate is just, gainst which it bends.
War burns about the town for thee; for thee our slaughter'd friends
Besiege Troy with their carcasses, on whose heaps our high walls
Are overlookt by enemies; the sad sounds of their falls
Without, are echo'd with the cries of wives and babes within;
And all for thee; and yet for them thy honour cannot win
Head of thine anger. Thou shouldst need no spirit to stir up thine,
But thine should set the rest on fire, and with a rage divine
Chastise impartially the best, that impiously forbears.
Come forth, lest thy fair towers and Troy be burn'd about thine ears.'*

*Paris acknowledg'd, as before, all just that Hector spake,
Allowing justice, though it were for his injustice' sake;
And where his brother put a wrath upon him by his art,
He takes it, for his honour's sake, as sprung out of his heart,
And rather would have anger seem his fault than cowardise;
And thus he answer'd: . . . (VI, 332-65.)*

* Hector dissembles the cowardice he finds in Paris; turning it, as if he chid him for his anger at the Trojans for hating him, being conquered by Menelaus, when it is for his effeminacy. Which is all paraphrasticall in my translation.

¹ VI, 321-4.

In this way Chapman polishes off as thoroughly as possible the matter of Paris' effeminacy. Where Homer, through Hector, has failed to rub it in, the translator takes care that his reader shall not miss the contrast between the two men, even if he has to point it in one of the 'needful paraphrases' referred to in the preface to the *Iliads*. Thus we are not allowed to miss the inner significance of the scene between the two men.

The two Lycian allies whom Chapman singled out for particular attention were Glaucus and Sarpedon.

Glaucus. Homer's Glaucus, in the Sixth Book, is deliberately made fun of with a kind of humour elsewhere reserved only for the gods. He has interrupted the battle to make a long speech to Diomedes about his ancestry, tracing his family tree back in a long and verbose vaunt. Diomedes, in reply, informs him that their grandsires were friends, and that he hopes to visit Glaucus in Lycia when the war is over. In the meantime he suggests that they shun each other in the fight. As token of their friendship he offers an exchange of arms. Glaucus is quick to accept, and thus becomes the butt of the joke—for, it seems, his own armour was of gold and worth five score oxen, where the armour of Diomedes was of bronze and worth only nine. Homer blithely accounts for his folly by remarking that Zeus deprived him of his wits. It is an hilarious moment and the text shows no sign of corruption.¹ But it will not do for Chapman. In the first place, he appends a note to the long speech of Glaucus informing us, in contradiction to the opinion of the scholiasts, that the long interruption at that moment was a good artistic device—it slowed down the action most appropriately, and one must imagine the Greeks all standing still while the discourse took place. When he comes to the exchange of armour, he does a good bit of conscious tinkering and again adds a note.

From horse then both descend,
Join hands, give faith, and take; and then did Jupiter elate*
The mind of Glaucus, who, to show his reverence to the state
Of vertue in his grandsire's heart, and gratulate beside

* Φέρων ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς, *Mentem ademit Jup.*, the text hath it; which only I alter of all Homer's originall, since Plutarch against the Stoicks excuses this supposed folly in Glaucus. Spondanus likewise encouraging my alterations, which I use for the loved and simple nobility of the free exchange in Glaucus, contrary to others that, for the supposed folly in Glaucus, turned his change into a proverb, χρῶσθα χρυσεόν, golden for brazen.

¹ *Iliad*, vi, 234-6.

*The offer of so great a friend, exchang'd, in that good pride,
Curets of gold for those of brass, that did on Diomed shine,
One of a hundred oxen's price, the other but of nine.* (VI, 241-7.)

The evidence is beginning to insinuate itself that Chapman felt he must, in his translation, keep up with the Stoics. We shall find more to this point as we proceed. Here, in the passage just quoted, Chapman shows himself to be biased in Glaucus' favour on account of the fine long speech he has just given and his ready response to Diomedes' offer. He makes his alteration in defence of Glaucus' character, not in order to expurgate the humour of Homer's remark. For he is careful, at other times, to call attention to the wit of his poet.¹

Sarpedon. Glaucus again comes in for a little extra honour in the speech which Sarpedon addresses to him in Book Twelve when urging him to join in leading a Lycian attack. This speech is another which Chapman much admires. Sarpedon tells Glaucus that on account of all the wealth they two possess in Lycia, they must prove to their people that they have been true kings in the fight, and that since death comes sooner or later to all men, they might as well risk it now. I shall not quote this speech in full, as it is only slightly touched up by Chapman; but the 'improvements' are all for the greater moral heightening of the two heroes. In the first place, Sarpedon chooses to address Glaucus because he cannot find anyone else 'as great as he in name, as great in mind as he' (XII, 310), and further on, in the course of his speech, Chapman makes him accentuate the importance of honour and brave deeds in such a way as clearly to bring out the moral:

*and shall we not exceed
As much in merit as in noise? Come, be we great in deed
As well as look; shine not in gold, but in the flames of fight.*

(XII, 317-9.)

But to return to the Grecian side again where the wealth of leadership shines with greater importance:

Agamemnon. In the preface to the 1598 edition of the *Seauen Bookes of the Iliades* Agamemnon is made to stand for 'Arrogancy', and the additional touches which Chapman made to his character in the course of his revisions were all directed to an analysis of his

¹ As in his note (XXIII, 587), 'Note the sharpness of wit in our Homer; if where you look not for it you can find it'. Which is exactly opposite to what he seems to have done in his version of the line; he has found 'wit' where it was not intended: 'I will bray His bones as in a mortar'. ἀντικρὺ χροῖα τε βήξω σὺν τ' ὄντι ἀράξω. (XXIII, 673.)

failures or successes in the art of kingship. He finds no place in Chapman's notes, and, like Achilles, failed fundamentally to interest him. The heightening of his kingly role is kept up occasionally in a perfunctory fashion, and if there is any emphasis on Agamemnon as a moral example it lies there rather than as an example of Arrogancy. Thus we can find him setting 'a glorious fight on foot' with the additional comment,

*and he examples this,
With toiling, like the worst, on foot. (IV, 238-9.)*

Or again, he is made to consider the good and the shame of the whole country—as a true king should—and to assure his people that the fight is not a private one on behalf of his brother's loss: this, in the lines added to his speech at the beginning of the Ninth Book when he is urging flight.

*My glory, nor my brother's wreak, were the proposéd ends,
For which he drew you to these toils, but your whole countries' shame,
Which had been huge to bear the rape of so divine a dame,
Made in despite of our revenge. And yet not that had mov'd
Our pow'rs to these designs, if Jove had not our drifts approv'd;
Which since we see he did for blood, 'tis desperate fight in us
To strive with him; then let us fly; 'tis flight he urgeth thus. (IX, 22-8.)*

Menelaus. Agamemnon's brother is another matter. He bulks larger in Chapman's notes than all the other heroes of the *Iliad* put together. Where Agamemnon was referred to in the Preface of 1598 as Arrogancy, Menelaus was Detraction. (They were both vices to which Chapman himself was prone, however much he may have tried to shout them down.)

We meet with Chapman's first interpretation of his character in a commentary to the Second Book. This formidable note takes its rise in an explanation of a point of translation. Chapman has translated the Homeric formula, *βοὴν ἀγαθὸς*, 'at-a-martial-cry Good Menelaus . . . came' (II, 355), and proceeds in his note to explain, with his habitual researches into Scapula, the condenser of Estienne's Graeco-Latin thesaurus, why he has diverged from the regular, *voce bonus*, or *bello strenuus*, to the qualifying 'martial'. 'Fights are often made with clamour,' he says, and this kind of martial noise is the one which best fits the character of Menelaus. That character he then expounds as the chief laughing-stock of Homer's genius.

Homer (speaking scotically) breaks open the fountain of his ridiculous humour following, never by any interpreter understood, or touched at,

being yet the most ingenious conceited person that any man can show in any heroicall poem, or in any comick poet. And that you may something perceive him before you read to him in his severall places, I will, as I can in haste, give you him here together as Homer at all parts presents him—viz., simple, well-meaning, standing still affectedly on telling truth, small, and shrill voiced, (not sweet, or eloquent, as some most against the hair would have him) short spoken, after his country the Laconicall manner, yet speaking thick and fast, industrious in the field, and willing to be employed; and (being *mollis bellator* himself) set still to call to every hard service the hardest; even by the wit of Ajax played upon, about whom he would still be diligent, and what he wanted of the martiall fury and faculty himself, that he would be bold to supply out of Ajax; Ajax and he, to any for blows; Antilochus and he for wit; (Antilochus, old Nestor's son, a most ingenious, valiant, and excellently formed person); sometimes valiant, or daring (as what coward is not?) sometimes falling upon sentence and good matter in his speeches (as what meanest capacity doth not?). Nor useth our most inimitable imitator of nature this cross and deformed mixture of his parts, more to colour and avoid too broad a taxation of so eminent a person, than to follow the true life of nature, being often, or always exprest so disparent in her creatures. And therefore the decorum that some poor criticks have stood upon, to make fools always foolish, cowards at all times cowardly, &c., is far from the variant order of nature, whose principle being contrary, her productions must needs contain the like opposition.

Here, as in so many of the notes, we have evidence that Chapman was not looking for allegorical 'mysteries' in Homer, but for the mysteries of human nature, the ever variable—a grain of sense in a fool, an unexpectedly valiant deed from a coward. But this is not the end of his notation. Leaning heavily on the notes in Spondanus, the commentator whose text he was using, and taking his Plutarchan quotation from him, he goes on to explain the rest of his translation of the sentence in question.

All these he bade; but at-a-martiall-cry—
Good Menelaus, since he saw his brother busily
Employ'd at that time, *would not stand on invitation*,
But of himself came. (II, 355-8.)

But now to the first; *αὐτόματος δὲ οἱ ἦλθε*, &c., *spontaneus autem ei venit*, &c., about which a passing great piece of work is pickt out by our greatest philosophers, touching the unbidden coming of Menelaus to supper or counsell, which some commend, others condemn in him; but the reason why he staid not the invitement, rendered immediately by Homer, none of them will understand—viz., "*Ἦιδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν* &c., *sciebat enim in animo quantum frater laborabat*; of which verse his interpreters cry out for expunction, only because it was never entered in their apprehension,

which I more than admire (for the easiness of it) so freely offering itself to their entertainment, and yet using the hoof of Pegasus, only with a touch breaking open (as abovesaid) the fountain of his humour. For thus I expound it (laying all again together, to make it plain enough for you); Agamemnon, inviting all the chief commanders to supper, left out his brother; but he, seeing how much his brother was troubled about the dream, and busied, would not stand upon invitement, but came of himself. And this being spoken *scopticè*, or by way of irrision, argueth what manner of man he made him. *Ineptus enim* (as it is affirmed in Plutarch, 1. Symp. and second question) *fuit Menelaus, et locum dedit proverbio, qui ad consilium dandum accessisset non vocatus*. And to this place he had reference, because a councill of war was to be held at this supper. And here, I say, Homer opened the vein of his simplicity, not so much in his going unbidden to supper, and counsell, as in the reason for it ironically rendered, that he knew his brother was busy, &c. And yet that addition, without which the very sense of our poet is not safe, our interpreters would have raced.

This is but the beginning. Chapman believed that a great deal could be learned about the folly of human nature from a study of that foolish braggart—as he saw him—Menelaus.

The next point that is brought to our attention is an analysis of his voice in a note to Book III, l. 234. Again with recourse to the different definitions in Scapula, Chapman decides that it is wrong to say that Menelaus spoke succinctly, or compendiously, but that 'his utterance' was 'noiseful, small, or squeaking; an excellent pipe for a fool,' that he spoke fast and thick and yet used few words. And he goes on to take exception to the regular translation, *bellicosus*, for the stock epithet applied to Menelaus, ἀρηίφιλος, maintaining that it meant rather *cui Mars est carus*,

because he might love the war, and yet be no good warrior, as many love many exercises at which they will never be good; and Homer gave it to him for another of his peculiar epithets, as a vainglorious affectation in him, rather than a solid affection.

Even this is not the worst that can be said of him, for Chapman has not yet touched on his cuckoldry, and he is to find that when Menelaus refers to this ignominy he is even more foolish than usual. Chapman plumbs for us the full depths of his marvellous stupidity, as he sees it, in a comment to the Thirteenth Book even longer than the notes already quoted. This comment refers to the 'insultation' (556f.) which Menelaus addresses to the Trojans on the field of battle. He is setting forth a list of abuses which they have done him and his countrymen, including, of course, the ravishing of his bride, his

κοιριδιήν ἄλοχον, a phrase which Spondanus accurately translated *virginem uxorem*, but which Chapman insists should here be rendered *juvenilem uxorem*, or as he turns it, 'in flower of all her years'. This is a good way of cutting the gordian knot, that question debated by the commentators, whether Homer was so ignorant as to allow Menelaus to have believed that Helen was a virgin when she came to him, when, as we know, she had already borne Iphigenia to Theseus. Part of this note, at least, must be quoted direct, as it so well amplifies the moral lesson which we are watching Chapman draw from his study of this character.

But all this time I lose my collection of Menelaus' silly and ridiculous upbraids here given to the Trojans. First (as above said) for ravishing his wife in the flower of her years:—when should a man play such a part but then?—though indeed poor Menelaus had the more wrong or loss in it, and yet Paris the more reason. He added then, and without cause or injury, a most sharp one in Homer, and in Menelaus as much ridiculous; as though lovers looked for more cause in their love-suits than the beauties of their beloved; or that men were made cuckolds only for spite, or revenge of some wrong precedent. But indeed Menelaus' true simplicity is this, to think harms should not be done without harms foregoing (no not in these unsmarting harms) maketh him well deserve his epithet ἀγαθός. Yet further see how his pure imbecility prevaleth: and how by a thread Homer cutteth him out here, ἐπεὶ φιλέεσθε παρ' αὐτῇ, *postquam amicè tractati fuistis apud ipsam*, after ye had been kindly entertained at her hands. I hope you will think nothing could encourage them more than that. See how he speaketh against her in taking her part, and how ingeniously Homer giveth him still some colour of reason for his senselessness, which colour yet is enough to deceive our commentators; they find not yet the tame figure of our horned; but they and all translators still force his speeches to the best part.

And so he proceeds through an elucidation of Menelaus' inanities, showing how the critics have missed the full flavour of his simplicity. He quotes at length from Spondanus' comment on the passage, only to accuse him of blindness, and at the end—pretty well worn down with the specious argument—his reader is ready to echo one of the few really vivid phrases in this comment: 'I am weary with beating this thin thicket for a woodcock!'

With this exclamation in mind, we shall skip the rest of Chapman's annotations on Menelaus. He is taken as the true type of the simple gull, who, although harbouring contrary impulses in his nature, is most often ridiculous and cowardly. He emerges for all of us, I imagine, one of the most individualized of Homer's characters; for

Chapman, he was a true example of many human stupidities, and consequently one of the best *lessons* in the poem.

Ajax. Telamonian Ajax is another dull fellow, though not so interesting to Chapman as Menelaus. Our attention is called to his dullness in a comment on the Sixteenth Book (111) which takes its rise from a point of interpretation. Here Chapman coins the adjective 'Aiantical' as an equivalent for 'dull', and says that the passage under discussion is a plain continuance 'of Ajax' humour, whom in divers other places he plays upon, as in likening him, in the Eleventh Book, to a mill ass, and elsewhere to be noted hereafter'. But even this dull mill ass had a streak of philosophy in him, or else Chapman forgot the character he had just given him. For in the next book we find him encouraging the leaders with the following stoical utterance, added by the translator:

O know
Jove gives both grace and dignity to any that will show
Good minds for only good itself, though presently the eye
Of him that rules discern him not. (XVII, 218-21.)

This survey of the heroes pretty well covers the use to which Chapman put the *Iliad* for the purpose of moral instruction. At best, we feel that the lessons derived are splotchy: lines added here and there to heighten the dignity or enhance the shrewdness of the men, notes which inform us of their essential 'humours'. Chapman's interpretation really is a matter of emphasis rather than of any sustained theory. In this respect, we shall find a noticeable difference in his translation of the *Odyssey*.

Ulysses. In reading Chapman's translation of the *Odysseys*, although one pauses over passages of especially glowing description and again over figurative embellishments of the translator's invention, one's chief interest in the poem becomes before long the character of the hero himself. Ulysses was the hero of Chapman's heart and on him he lavishes his most devoted attention. An examination of Ulysses' character as it emerges in the translation brings Chapman's 'Homericall labours' into focus with his tragedies and poetic compositions. Chapman, like the Stoics, found in Homer's Ulysses the incarnation of many manly virtues; and in his enthusiasm for this discovery, endowed him with so many more than he originally had, that he emerges from the translation as good a stoical hero as

the renowned Clermont d'Ambois, a pre-eminent exemplification of the 'good life' as defined in Chapman's philosophical poems of Epictetan origin.

For the past thirty years scholars have become increasingly interested in Chapman's debt to the Stoics. Professor F. L. Schoell, who proved that Chapman knew Epictetus through the Latin version of Wolfius (1563, 1593), observed that the years 1610-1612 were the period in Chapman's life when he 'n'a pas su résister à l'attrait du beau stoïcisme d'Épictète, tout parfumé de sagesse antique, et pourtant, par quelques côtés, si proche du christianisme'.¹ This period may well be extended through 1615, for the translation of the *Odyssey* shows clearly the fascination that stoical doctrine continued to hold for him.

For some reason, difficult to ascertain, Chapman felt *free* when he embarked on his task of translating the *Odyssey*. He had somehow escaped the compulsion which had been upon him when translating the last twelve books of the *Iliad* to silence his critics by scholarly proof that he was translating accurately. Although there are notes to the different books of the *Odysseys*, they are short and relatively few in number. Free in mind, poor in pocket: this is the Chapman who made of the *Odyssey*, in Coleridge's words, 'as truly an original poem as the Faery Queene.'

The theme of the *Odyssey*, however, was near enough his heart to sustain him in the most hostile universe. It was fundamentally much more sympathetic to him than that of the *Iliad*.

And that your Lordship, [he wrote addressing Somerset] may in his face take view of his mind, the first word of his *Iliads* is *μῆνιν*, wrath; the first word of his *Odysseys*, *άνδρα*, man; contracting in either word his each work's proposition. In one, predominant perturbation; in the other, overruling wisdom: in one, the body's fervour and fashion of outward fortitude to all possible height of heroic action; in the other, the mind's inward, constant and unconquered empire; unbroken, unaltered, with any most insolent and tyrannous infliction.

As Essex was inferred to have much in common with Achilles, so now we hear of Somerset's 'Ulyssean patience'; and in this one word, patience, we have a touch-stone to the heart of Chapman's innermost and unfulfilled desire. He endowed his tragic hero, Clermont, with this quality, and it was a master virtue in his series of stoical poems. By every right Ulysses should have been perfectly patient and stoical

¹ *Etudes sur l'Humanisme Continental en Angleterre à la Fin de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1926), 107.

—as renaissance critics had assumed him to be—and so, when oft-times his powers of endurance fail him, Chapman in friendly fashion, bolsters him up.

Chapman's Ulysses is first and foremost a pious man, one who is able to endure the decrees of a just god even when they are harsh, who can distinguish between those things which are in his own power to do and those which are not. He is a man whose 'naked virtue' is immediately apparent to the beholder even when he appears clad in rags or not clad at all. And furthermore, this virtue is an acquired one. He is a man who has drained the cup of experience and learned the lesson of true piety through suffering.

The temper of his mind is perhaps most fully evident in the speech which he makes to the wooer, Amphinomus, when he urges him to betake himself home. In quoting this speech we go really to the heart of the matter, for it is the one speech in Homer which most nearly justifies Chapman's interpretation of Ulysses. In it, Homer makes his hero address the wooer as one man of understanding to another, and the thesis of his address is that man must not be lawless lest he court the evil gifts which the gods have in store for him, but must quietly content himself with the good gifts which they have seen fit to bestow.¹ This speech was one after Chapman's own heart and gave him a good basis to work on. I feel that it would have been his first answer to anyone who accused him, as I am doing, of having made Ulysses more pious than he really was. So let us meet the argument at the outset and watch the way in which he amplifies the speech, the first eighteen lines being turned into thirty-eight.

'Amphinomus,' said he, 'you seem to me
Exceeding wise, as being the progeny
Of such a father as authentique Fame
Hath told me was so, one of honour'd name,
And great revennues in Dulichius;
His fair name Nisus. *He is blazon'd thus;*
And you to be his son, his wisdom heiring,
As well as wealth, his state in nought empairing.
To prove which always, let me tell you this,
(As warning you to shun the miseries
That follow full states, if they be not held
With wisdom still at full, and so compell'd
To courses that abode not in their brows,
By too much swindge, their sodain overthrows)
Of all things breathing, or that creep on earth,

¹ *Od.*, XVIII, 125-50.

Nought is more wretched than a human birth.
 Bless'd men think never they can cursed be,
 While any power lasts to move a knee.
 But when the blest Gods make them feel that smart,
That fled their faith so, as they had no heart
 They bear their sufferings, *and, what well they might*
Have clearly shunn'd, they then meet in despite.
 The mind of man flies still out of his way,
 Unless God guide and prompt it every day.
 I thought me once a blessed man with men,
And fashion'd me to all so counted then,
Did all injustice like them, what for lust,
Or any pleasure, never so unjust
I could by power or violence obtain,
And gave them both in all their powers the rein,
 Bold of my fathers and my brothers still;
While which held good my arts seem'd never ill.
And thus is none held simply good or bad,
But as his will is either mist or had.
 All goods God's gifts man calls, how e'er he gets them;
 And so takes all, what price so e'er God sets them,
Says nought how ill they come, nor will controul
That ravine in him, though it cost his soul.' (XVIII, 174-211.)

How, then, has Chapman weighted the scales? With the precept of self-knowledge. To the simple fatalism of the Homeric passage he has added the advice that man must know himself and what he is about. He must know how to conduct himself when he is in a state of prosperity; must recognize an evil deed for what it is even when he seems to get away with it; and must save his soul by an intelligent control of his base lusts and passions. Ulysses is recommending an increase of cerebration as well as of piety. This is the most important transformation which the passage has undergone. But, in addition, it has been made more doctrinal through the epigrammatic turn which Chapman has given to Homer's two most poetically sententious utterances. So he distorts the Greek simile which compares man's mind to his day—both gifts of Zeus¹—into:

The mind of man flies still out of his way,
 Unless God guide and prompt it ev'ry day.

He thus sacrifices a figure of speech for the aphoristic finality of a rather nicely turned couplet. And again, where Homer's Ulysses concludes his fatalistic utterance with the precept: 'Wherefore let

¹ XVIII, 136-7.

no man ever be lawless any more, but keep quietly the gifts of the gods, whatsoever they may give,'¹ Chapman loses the whole force of the precept for the sake of summing up the argument in two epigrammatic couplets:

All goods God's gifts man calls, how e'er he gets them,
And so takes all, what price so e'er God sets them,
Says nought how ill they come, nor will controul
That ravine in him, though it cost his soul.

Let us take this picture then as a starting point: a self-conscious, analytic Ulysses, eminently pious, who is given to epigrammatic turns of phrase.

To keep this picture fairly well intact, it was necessary for Chapman to rationalize any failings which the Stoics might have found in his hero and to heighten those original endowments of which they approved. For one thing, the Stoics found a grave moral failure in the easy tears which the Homeric heroes shed, and Ulysses is the Homeric hero whom Epictetus singled out for his particular disapprobation in this respect. The argument is that every man who is absolutely good must be happy.

For that which is happy must have all that it desires, must resemble a person who is filled with food, and must have neither thirst nor hunger.—But Ulysses felt a desire for his wife and wept as he sat on a rock.—Do you attend to Homer and his stories in every thing? Or if Ulysses really wept, what was he else than an unhappy man? and what good man is unhappy? In truth the whole is badly administered, if Zeus does not take care of his own citizens that they may be happy like himself. But these things are not lawful nor right to think of: and if Ulysses did weep and lament, he was not a good man.²

But, Chapman would argue, Ulysses *was* a good man! Was he not the hero of the greater of the divine Homer's two epics? What then is the solution to the paradox? He does not attempt to do anything for his hero when he sat on a rock and wept with desire for his wife, but another scene gives him an opportunity to explain how a sensitive responsiveness to life—one's own and others'—may make even the strongest man weep. The scene is in the court of Alcinous, and Demodocus has just finished singing of the glorious and cruel war and the ultimate fall of Troy. 'This was the song', wrote Homer, 'that the famous minstrel sang. But the heart of Odysseus melted

¹ XVIII, 141-2.

² Epictetus, *Discourses*, Book III, xxiv, trans. George Long (London, 1887).

and the tear wet his cheeks beneath the eyelids.¹ In place of which simple statement, Chapman writes the following passage which is entirely of his own invention and not inspired, like so many of his critical additions, by any note in Spondanus.

*This the divine expressor did so give
Both act and passion, that he made it live,
And to Ulysses' facts did breath a fire
So deadly quickning, that it did inspire
Old death with life, and render'd life so sweet,
And passionate, that all there felt it fleet;
Which made him pity his own cruelty,
And put into that ruth so pure an eye
Of human frailty, that to see a man
Could so revive from death, yet no way can
Defend from death, his own quick powers it made
Feel there death's horrors, and he felt life fade,
In tears his feeling brain sweet; for, in things
That move past utterance, tears ope all their springs.
Nor are there in the powers that all life bears
More true interpreters of all than tears. (VIII, 708-23.)*

What could be more generally compassionate than this? It was doubtless designed to prepare the reader to accept the simile immediately following in which the hero's tears are compared to the pitiful grief of a woman who throws herself on the body of her dying husband, fallen in defence of his city. The effeminate comparison becomes far more acceptable when it has once been established that tears are the truest interpretative power which life has to offer.

Not content, however, with having made this point once, Chapman takes it up again almost immediately at the beginning of the Ninth Book where Ulysses yields to the king's request and starts to tell his tale. Homer's twelve-line preamble to Ulysses' tale shows the hero to be in a comfortable state of self-indulgence. He is pleased with his festive and friendly surroundings; he is pleased to be able to tell his tale in order that he may indulge his desire to mourn. In the words of John A. Scott's literal translation, he thus begins:

King Alcinous, most notable of all the people, verily it is a good thing to list to a minstrel such as this one, like to the gods in voice. Nay, as for me, I say that there is no more gracious or perfect delight than when a whole people makes merry, and the men sit orderly at feast in the halls and listen to the singer, and the tables by them are laden with bread and flesh, and a wine-bearer drawing the wine serves it round and pours it

¹ VIII, 521-2.

into cups. This seems to me wellnigh the fairest thing in the world. But now thy heart was inclined to ask of my grievous troubles, that I may mourn for more exceeding sorrow.

The thirty lines with which Chapman replaces the Homeric twelve are a masterpiece of rationalization. Both the physical and the emotional pleasure which Ulysses is feeling are raised through his argument to a spiritual level.

Alcinous, in whom this empire stands,
*You should not of so natural right disherit
 Your princely feast, as take from it the spirit.*
 To hear a poet, that in accent brings
 The Gods' breasts down, *and breathes them as he sings,*
Is sweet, and sacred; nor can I conceive,
In any common-weal, what more doth give
Note of the just and blessed empery,
 Than to see comfort universally
 Cheer up the people, *when in every roof*
She gives observers a most human proof
Of men's contents. To see a neighbour's feast
Adorn it through; and thereat hear the breast
 Of the divine Muse; men in order set;
 A wine-page waiting; tables crown'd with meat,
 Set close to guests *that are to use it skill'd;*
The cup-boards furnisht, and the cups still fill'd;
 This shows, to my mind, most *humanely* fair.
Nor should you, for me, still the heavenly air,
That stirr'd my soul so; for I love such tears
As fall from fit notes, beaten through mine ears
With repetitions of what heaven hath done,
And break from hearty apprehension
Of God and goodness, though they shew my ill.
 And therefore doth my mind excite me still,
 To tell my bleeding moan; *but much more now,*
To serve your pleasure, that to over-flow
My tears with such cause may by sighs be driven,
 Though ne'er so much plagued I may seem by heaven. (IX, 2-30.)

Again the tears are interpreters of experience. They are a direct response to the notes of the singer who in telling of the deeds and sorrows of men has merely repeated the actions motivated by a good God. Homer has said that Demodocus was 'like to the gods in voice', and on this slender thread of suggestion Chapman has hung the whole argument which links Ulysses' tears with his pious acknowledgement of divine justice. Although the telling of his tale will

serve further to sink him in sorrow, he will do it solely for the pleasure of his host. It is a perfect example of the analytical man created out of Chapman's preconceptions as to what he should be. The figure of speech which he introduces is also interesting. The pleasant scene is the work of a personified 'Comfort' who has arranged it in order to bring out the happy humanity of which men are capable. Hence it becomes an encouraging lesson to the partaker of those pleasures rather than a simple gratification of his sensual nature.

The relationship of Ulysses' tears to the divine origin of man's activities as rationally expounded in the foregoing passage brings us close to the heart of the analysis which Chapman makes of the nature of his hero's piety. The clue to Ulysses' philosophy of life is clearly stoical. Epictetus divided all men into five classes with respect to their beliefs concerning the gods. In the fifth and most perspicacious class, the class which entertains the belief that the gods exercise forethought about every specific deed which is done by man, he places Socrates and Ulysses. The class is described by a line from the *Iliad*, considered by some commentators to be non-Homeric,¹ in which Ulysses prays to Athena as one who stands by him among all dangers and without whose knowledge he never moves.² Epictetus believes this to be the pious and rational way of looking at the gods, and Chapman was convinced, with Spondanus, that it was Homer's way as well as that of his hero.

The piety and wisdom of the Poet was such, that (agreeing with the Sacred Letter) not the least of things he makes come to pass *sine Numinis providentia*. As Spond. well notes of him.

Thus Chapman writes of Athena's intervention when the 'chance stool-ball' struck by Nausicaa wakes the naked hero from his exhausted sleep.³

But what of the actual plight and conduct of Homer's hero in the light of his religious beliefs? Although he had been wild in his youth, and probably had done altogether too much scheming, the divine punishment meted out to him was far too great for the crime. His guardian goddess herself admits this when, in the First Book, she makes her plea to Zeus to ameliorate his lot.

¹ For this information I am indebted to Dr. Frank Kramer.

² *Discourses*, I, xii. The lines from which Epictetus quotes are *Il.*, x, 278-80.

³ Note to *Od.*, vi, 165. 'Her mean was this, though thought a stool-ball chance.'

But, that Ithacus,
 Thus never meriting, should suffer thus,
 I deeply suffer. *His more pious mind*
Divides him from these fortunes. Though unkind
Is piety to him, giving him a fate
More suffering than the most unfortunate. (1, 79-84.)

The goddess' admission that he is a good man but poorly rewarded is found in Homer; her specific statement that his *piety* merits something better has been added by Chapman. Thus he gets off on the right foot at the start and may well have felt that Scaliger's impious preference of Aeneas to Ulysses was at last outwitted.¹ Aeneas may have introduced himself by announcing that he was a pious man, but the gods themselves so introduced Ulysses. Now, Homer's Ulysses knew very well that he was not being treated fairly, and made constant complaint against the injustice of the gods, a flagrant offence against stoic principles. (If he had practised the doctrine of acceptance, he would have been happy in his own mind and would not, for instance, have even felt like weeping with desire for his wife.) This is just the point where Chapman's picture of the stoical hero falls down. He is too honest to leave these complaints unrecorded. What he does do is to take sides squarely with Ulysses (after all, a goddess had done the same and acknowledged the fact of heavenly injustice!), and to stress his continued piety in the face of this injustice and show how Ulysses intelligently rationalized the grounds of his complaint. With this end in view, he adds lines of verse and notes with a lavish hand.

The process is like this. When Ulysses is tossed up on shore after battling with the angry ocean and finally recovers his senses, he decides to make for a covert where he will be protected and can get his so much needed rest. Chapman translates this passage from the Fifth Book, and then proceeds to show how Ulysses' resolution to yield himself up to sleep is really an act of piety. With this intent, he adds the following lines:

Best appaid
Doth that course make me yet; for there, some strife,

¹ 'Not less exalted praise is Virgil's when we observe his imitation of the lines from the Ninth Book of the *Odyssey*, which run, "I am Odysseus, son of Laertes, who am in men's minds for all manner of wiles, and my fame reaches unto heaven." "I am the pious Aeneas," he tells us first of all, "who rescued from the foe my household goods, and in my fleet carry them with me." He does not rashly babble about his prowess, for he is both a pious man and a brave.' *Select Translations from Scaliger's Poetics*, trans. F. M. Padelford, 'Yale Studies in English', xxvi (New Haven, 1905), 80.

*Strength, and my spirit, may make me make for life;
Which, though empair'd, may yet be fresh applied,
Where peril possible of escape is tried.
But he that fights with heaven, or with the sea,
To indiscretion adds impiety.* (v, 637-43.)

This argument is thoroughly stoical.¹ Using his rational faculties, Ulysses has decided that it is best to sleep for the time being in order that he may regain strength against an hour of peril from which it may be possible to escape. Reason leads him to piety in his resolution not to fight heaven or sea.

Or the insistence on his continued piety in the face of adversity may simply be in the form of a note. Thus, when Ulysses reaches the sacred grove near the town of the Phaeacians and offers up a prayer to Athena who has deserted him in his hour of need, Chapman quietly remarks: 'More of our Poet's curious and sweet piety'. (vi, 506 n.) And again, when he has escaped from the Cyclop, he sacrifices the thighs of a ram to Jove, although he gains nothing by so doing. 'No occasion let pass,' writes Chapman, 'to Ulysses' piety in our Poet's singular wit and wisdom.' (ix, 751 n.) This is Chapman's first method of mitigating Ulysses' undeniable lapses from stoicism: to balance his complaints against the gods by stressing his continued respect for their powers. Suitable sacrifice and a knowledge of what is not within one's own power to do—this is sound stoical practice and doctrine.

The second method is to show Ulysses rationalizing the grounds of his complaint. Chapman takes occasion in the Thirteenth Book to go into this matter thoroughly. Ulysses has been put down on his native shore by the kindly Phaeacians, and on waking has encountered Athena in the guise of a young shepherd. After considerable interchange of guileful conversation, she sees fit to reveal herself to him. He explains why it is that he has not recognized her. 'Hard is it, goddess, for a mortal man that meets thee to discern thee, howsoever wise he be; for thou takest upon thee every shape.'² This in two lines, but Chapman chooses the opportunity to let loose the reins of reason.

*'Goddess,' said he, 'unjust men, and unwise,
That author injuries and vanities,
By vanities and wrongs should rather be
Bound to this ill-abearing destiny,*

¹ See Epictetus, *Encheiridion*, xxxi.

² XIII, 312-13.

*Than just and wise men. What delight hath heaven,
That lives unhurt itself, to suffer given
Up to all damage those poor few that strive
To imitate it, and like the Deities live?
But where you wonder that I know you not
Through all your changes, that skill is not got
By sleight or art, since thy most hard-hit face
Is still distinguish'd by thy free-given grace;
And therefore, truly to acknowledge thee
In thy encounters, is a mastery
In men most-knowing; for to all men thou
Tak'st several likeness. All men think they know
Thee in their wits; but, since thy seeming view
Appears to all, and yet thy truth to few,
Through all thy changes to discern thee right
Asks chief love to thee, and inspired light.'* (XIII, 452-71.)

In the first lines of this interpolation the statement made by Athena in the First Book that Ulysses was too *pious* to have merited such misfortunes is elaborated by the hero himself. He has lived a life in imitation of the gods (no suggestion at this point of his lawless youth), and has failed to receive divine justice. The question which he thereupon asks is recurrent in the *Discourses* of Epictetus. The answer, of course, is that since none of the aspects of an easy life really belongs to you, you should not care at all how easy a life the immortals live; you must learn to be happy in your own mind which is yours to govern and enjoy. But this answer never remotely occurred to Ulysses, and Chapman does not try to foist it upon him. He takes pains, however, further to excuse Ulysses for not having recognized Athena. Homer made him offer two excuses: that she assumed so many shapes, and that she had not appeared at all to him for ten years.¹ This second is given at length by both Homer and Chapman in the lines immediately following those just quoted. But Chapman offers a third. Since she appears truly to so few people, she can only be recognized through a flight of inspiration. If it were a mere matter of intelligence or craft, then Ulysses would have known her right away. For was he not the crafty Ulysses, the man of many devices? The upshot of all this is that Chapman has chosen to show the how and why of Ulysses' failure by making him vastly more analytical than his Homeric prototype. It is the same mind at work as in the

¹ Spondanus expounds these two reasons in his note on the passage, but adds nothing which has found its way into Chapman's interpolation. *Homeri Quae Extant Omnia* . . . , (Basiliae, 1583), 253.

speech to Amphinomus: the dramatization, one may easily believe, of Chapman's own response to a cruel world.

This, then, is Chapman's Ulysses, a far more important personage in his eyes than any hero of the *Iliad*. He has become a moral hero of the renaissance. One of the chief contentions in Chapman's Epistle Dedicatory to the *Odysseys* was that fictive writing can be as valuable and informative as historical writing.

. . . why, [he asks], should a poor chronicler of a Lord Mayor's naked Truth (that peradventure will last his year) include more worth with our modern wizards than Homer for his naked Ulysses clad in eternal fiction?

Even though he had doubtless embarked on his translation with this traditional belief already in mind, he must have felt especially righteous and sure of himself when he penned his rhetorical question. For what greater service could he possibly have done his countrymen than to rescue for the English reader the almost perfect picture of the stoical man? He could preach stoical doctrine from the stage, he could translate stoical poems, but if he could once show that the whole weight of Homer was behind this philosophy, more than half the battle was won. For the wise man, to read should have been to believe.

AN ASPECT OF THE EVOLUTION OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PROSE¹

BY JOAN BENNETT

In the sixty odd years between Francis Bacon's trumpet call to progress in *The Advancement of Learning*² and the triumphant, self-confident reply of the Royal Society, English prose transformed itself. Pulpit orators, political theorists, or virtuosi shaped their style in accordance with a current doctrine. Out of a new way of looking at the world was born a new way of writing, and the prevalent change in practice was accompanied by a clearly articulated change in theory. The new prose was shaped to accord with the new tasks imposed upon the writer. The men who used it were often in radical opposition to one another; but the time spirit united them none the less, as we can see when we survey them from our distance in time. Distance dwarfs and effaces the detail of a landscape and gives it a general character; from a hill-top the variegated fields can look as similar as the squares of a chess-board. So, if we refrain, for some special purpose, from looking closely at the individual writers in those years, a general pattern emerges. Less and less were men content to 'understand a mystery without a rigid definition, in an easie Platonick description'. Sir Thomas Browne's 'visible world that is but a picture of the invisible, wherein as in a pourtract, things are not truely, but in equivocall shapes; and as they counterfeit some more reall substance in that invisible fabrick', gradually ceased to be thought the 'proper study of Mankind'. With few exceptions men ceased to be interested in the perceived world as an adumbration of the eternal; they were interested in it because it could be known, and managed to man's advantage. As attention confined itself more and more to the fact

¹ A first draft of this essay was written when my attention was drawn to two valuable articles by Prof. R. F. Jones: *Science and English Prose Style in the Third Quarter of the Seventeenth Century*, *PMLA*, Vol. xlv, 1930, and *The Attack on Pulpit Eloquence in the Restoration*, *JEGP*, Vol. xxx, 1931. Professor Jones draws upon some sources which are not tapped here and his learned articles tend to confirm and complete the picture I have tried to sketch.

² 1605.

that can be verified by experience, whether material fact or moral fact, so certain qualities of prose which were once its glory, became an impediment. When the eagle decides to walk, its wings are an encumbrance.

The prose writer's new purpose was to deal with matters of fact, that could be verified. The approach to a problem that was discovered to be proper for a natural philosopher, was widely applied to all the affairs of men, to the saving of souls or the ordering of society, no less than to the inquiry into the possibility of constructing a clinical thermometer. Consequently the meaning of words should, it was thought, be defined with the same precision for any discourse, as for the description of an experiment. Bacon writes:¹

Yet certaine it is that wordes, as a Tartars Bowe, doe shoote backe upon the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle, and pervert the Judgment. So as it is almost necessary in all controversies and disputations, to imitate the wisdom of the Mathematicians, in setting downe in the verie beginning, the definitions of our wordes and termes, that others may knowe howe wee accept and understand them, and whether they concurre with us or no.

Hobbes insists again and again on the troublesome confusions that arise from ill-defined words, 'for neither error, nor non-sense, can without a perfect understanding of words, be detected'.² Like Bacon, he turns to the mathematicians as exemplars of the proper way to use language; they at least, cannot go wrong in their reasoning through ignorance of the meaning of the words they use:

For it is most true that *Cicero* sayth of them somewhere; that there can be nothing so absurd, but may be found in the books of Philosophers. And the reason is manifest. For there is not one of them that begins his ratiocination from the Definitions, or Explications of the names they are to use; which is a method that hath been used only in Geometry; whose Conclusions have thereby been made indisputable.

The first cause of Absurd conclusions I ascribe to the want of Method; in that they begin not their Ratiocination from Definitions; that is from settled significations of their words: as if they could cast account, without knowing the value of the numerall words, *one, two and three*.³

In the same spirit, Locke asserts⁴ that no clear thought is possible without first circumscribing words to a clearly defined meaning:

Let us look into the Books of Controversies of any kind, there we shall

¹ *Advancement of Learning*, Bk. II.

² *Leviathan*, 1651, Pt. I, c. 11.

³ *Leviathan*, I, c. v.

⁴ *Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, 1690, Book III, c. XI, § 6.

see, that the effect of obscure, unsteady, or equivocal Terms, is nothing but noise and wrangling about Sounds, without convincing or bettering a Man's Understanding. For if the *Idea* be not agreed on, betwixt the Speaker and Hearer, for which the Words stand, the Argument is not about Things but Names.

The value of such counsel, for the purposes the writers had in view, is clear and indisputable. But, for some other purposes, it is not the definitions of words, but the penumbra of associations accumulated around them upon which communication depends. To be assured of this we have only to remind ourselves of Milton's use of words:

He that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true warfaring Christian. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and meets her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat.

It is easy to see how much of the effect of this depends upon half-remembered thoughts and feelings connected with, on the one hand, such words as *baits: seeming: fugitive and cloistered: slinks:* and, on the other, *warfaring Christian: sallies out: immortal garland*. Similarly it is no mere dictionary meaning that is operative in Donne's use of the words *oyle: wine: milk: honey:* when he writes: 'How shall I put a just value upon God's great blessings of Wine and Oyle, and Milk and Honey when my tast is gone . . .' Such a use of words in prose is hardly separable from the use of imagery, and of this close interrelation the framers of the new doctrine were aware. Alongside their distrust of fluidity and ambiguity in the meanings of words, there grew up a distrust of metaphor and figurative language. All the tricks of speech which had for so long been, and indeed still remained, the principal skill taught in Grammar Schools and Universities, were now thought to be full of danger. Locke's indictment in the *Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* is typical.

If we would speak of Things as they are, we must allow, that all the Art of Rhetorick, besides Order and Clearness, [that is 'aside from' as the Americans would say] all the artificial and figurative application of Words Eloquence hath invented, are for nothing else, but to insinuate wrong *Ideas*, move the Passions, and thereby mislead the Judgment; and so indeed are perfect cheat: And therefore however laudable or allowable Oratory may render them in Harangues and popular Addresses, they are certainly, in all Discourses that pretend to inform or instruct, wholly to be avoided; and where Truth and Knowledge are concerned, cannot

but be thought a great fault, either of the Language or Person who makes use of them.¹

Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke are directly concerned with 'discourses that pretend to inform and instruct'. Knowledge was their object, and knowledge as it was then understood, matters of fact and of the relation between facts, and knowledge about social and political utility. But it is not only such men as these who sound a retreat from the arts of rhetoric; it is sounded as frequently in the advice to preachers, which abounds in the years following the Restoration. From the pulpit, too, men were to look principally for clear information about the world we live in, and therefore—

Amongst the first things that seem to be useless, may be reckon'd the high-tossing and swaggering Preaching; either mountingly Eloquent or profoundly Learned.²

It may be noted in passing that those undeveloped metaphors 'high-tossing and swaggering' (as though the preacher were a too spirited horse, requiring the curb) are entirely characteristic of Eachard's own lively style. But the persistent distrust of metaphor was eventually to have its effect in draining the life blood from English prose; and John Eachard, gifted writer though he was, must bear his share of the responsibility. He particularly disliked the far-sought comparisons common in the 'metaphysical' preaching of the first half of the century. He contrasts their overlavish use of metaphor with the economy of those 'Masters of Eloquence' Tully, and Cæsar, in whose writings, he says:

if you do light upon one or so, it shall not make your hair stand right up, or put you into a fit of Convulsion; but it shall be so soft, significant, and familiar, as if 'twere made for the very purpose. But as for the common sort of People that are addicted to this way of expression in their discourses; away presently to both the Indies, rake Heaven and Earth, down to the bottom of the Sea, then tumble over all Arts and Sciences, ransack all Shops and Ware-houses, spare neither Camp nor City, but they will have them. So fond are such deceived ones of these same gay words, that they count all discourses empty, dull, and cloudy, unless besparkl'd with these Glitterings.

The sermons of John Donne will yield examples of all the types of imagery Eachard refers to here, and even of the abrupt transitions from image to image, although Donne more often exhausts one before he passes on to another.

¹ *Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, Bk. III, x, § 34.

² *Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy*. John Eachard, 1670.

Here, for instance, is a passage from Sermon XXXIII, LXXX Sermons, on the text: *While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.*

Here the Holy Ghost is said to have fallen, which denotes a more earnest communicating of himselfe, a throwing, a pouring out of himselfe, upon those, upon whom he falls: he falls as a fall of waters, that covers that it falls upon; as a Hawk upon a prey, it desires and it will possesse that it falls upon; as an Army into a Country, it Conquers, and it Governs where it fals. The Holy Ghost fals, but far otherwise, upon the ungodly. *Whosoever shall fall upon this stone, shall be broken, but upon whomsoever this stone shall fall, it will grind him to powder.* Indeed, he fals upon him so, as haile fals upon him; he fals upon him so, as he fals from him, and leaves him in an obduration, and impenitibleness, and in an irrecoverable ruine of him, that hath formerly despised and despighted the Holy Ghost. But when the Holy Ghost fals not thus in the nature of a stone, but puts on the nature of a Dove, and a Dove with an Olive-branch, and that in the Ark, that is, testimonies of our peace, and reconciliation to God, in his Church, he fals as that kinde of lightning, which melts swords, and hurts not scabbards; the Holy Ghost shall melt thy soule, and not hurt thy body. . . .

Donne's images define and bring home to the senses or the imagination of his hearers, the various ways in which they are to understand the meaning of a phrase in the text. They are not arguments but illustrations. For instance, whether or no there really is 'a kind of lightening, which melts swords, and hurts not scabbards', is irrelevant. It is enough that men have at some time believed there could be, or even, merely, that they can conceive such a thing as possible when the image is offered to them. But Eachard clearly thinks of similitude as some sort of sham argument offering for a truth something which may be a mere deception; he speaks of:

Similitudes; which all the World know, carry with them but very small force of Argument, unless there be an exact agreement with that which is compared; of which there is very seldom any sufficient care taken. Besides, those that are addicted to this slender way of discourse, for the most part, do so weaken and enfeeble their judgment, by contenting themselves to understand by colours, features and glimpses, that they perfectly omit all the more profitable searching into the nature and causes of things themselves.

He is thinking of simile and metaphor as substitutes for facts and reasons, intruding into discourse under false pretences. Moreover, he presently adds, they are not only false arguments but they may also be false descriptions; it is important in his view that the resemblance should not only be a true likeness of the thing to which it is

compared, but should also be itself an accurate account of the facts. The passage in which this is explained opens with a lively piece of metaphorical writing:

I shall only add thus much: that such as go about to fetch blood into their pale and lean discourses, by the help of their brisk and sparkling Similitudes, ought well to consider whether their Similitudes be true. I am confident, Sir, you have heard it many and many a time (or, if need be, I can show you 't in a Book) that when the Preacher happens to talk, how that the things here below, will not satisfie the Mind of Man; then comes in, *the round World, which cannot fill the triangular Heart of Man*: Whereas every Butcher knows, that the Heart is no more triangular; than an ordinary Pear, or a Child's Top: But because Triangular is a hard word, and perhaps a jest, therefore people have stolen it from one another, these two or three hundred years . . .

He continues:

In like manner they are to consider, what things either in the Heavens or belonging to the Earth, have been found out by experience to contradict what has been formerly allowd of. Thus, because some ancient *Astronomers* had observ'd that both the distances, as well as the Revolutions of the Planets, were in some proportion or harmony to one another; therefore people that abounded more with imagination than skill, presently phansi'd the Moon, Mercury and Venus to be a kind of Violins or Trebles to Jupiter and Saturn; and that the Sun and Mars supplied the room of Tenors: And the *Primum Mobile* running Division all the time. So that one could scarce hear a Sermon, but they must give you a touch of the *Harmony of the Spheres* . . .

And finally:

I shall say no more upon this Subject, but this one thing . . . He that has got a set of Similitudes, calculated according to the old Philosophy, and Ptolemy's System of the World, must burn his Commonplace Book, and go a gleaning for new ones: It being now adays much more gentile and warrantable, to take a Similitude from the *Man* in the *Moon*, than from *solid Orbs*: for though few People do absolutely believe, that there is any such *Eminent Person* there, yet the thing is possible, whereas the other is not.

Behind all this lies an assumption about the nature and purpose of metaphor. Eachard is not concerned solely with the way in which a metaphor affects the reader's consciousness of the thing it represents (which Dr. I. A. Richards calls the 'tenour' as distinguished from the 'vehicle'); he is expecting something from the image (or 'vehicle') itself. And what he is expecting is accurate information. John Hoskins in his *Directions for Speech and Style* (1600) made a statement which might, if separated from the examples he gives, be thought to carry the

same implication: 'Besides', he writes, 'a metaphor is pleasant because it enricheth our knowledge with two things at once, with the truth and with a similitude . . .' John Smith repeats this word for word in his *Mysterie of Rhetorick Unveiled*, 1657 (a work largely composed of such unacknowledged quotations) and Hobbes makes the point in other words and more explicitly:

Metaphors please; for they beget in us, by the *Genus*, or by some *common* thing to that with another, a kind of *Science*: as when an *Old Man* is called *Stubble*, a man suddainly learns that he grows up, flourisheth, and withers like Grass, being put in mind of it by the qualities common to *Stubble* and *old men*.¹

Hobbes' example (taken from Homer via Aristotle) is described by him in such a way as to draw attention to facts common to grass and men, the facts of growth and decay; he ignores the emotional effect of the image and presents it as offering us 'a kind of Science'. The examples Hoskins chooses, and his comments on them, suggest that he meant something rather different by his words: 'enrich our knowledge with two things at once'. Here are two of his examples, both taken from his usual source, Sidney's *Arcadia*:

heads disinherited of the ir natural seigneuries whereby we understand both beheading and the government of the head over the body as the heir hath over the lordship which he inheriteth. Of the same matter in another place: *to divorce the fair marriage of the head and the body*, where besides the cutting off the head we understand the conjunction of head and body to resemble marriage.

It is clear that these peculiar metaphors do not convey any *facts* beyond their 'tenour' (that is, an execution). What appears to please Hoskins in them is that they may suggest that the relation between the parts of the body represents or symbolizes political and social relations in the body politic. To value metaphor because it suggests relations between things 'apparently unlike' is not the same as to value it because it conveys knowledge. The particular kind of truth, or accurate correspondence with fact, which Eachard demands from metaphor would exclude all illustrations drawn from myth or fable (whereas Hoskins approves of these). In short, the road along which the later critics of prose style are pointing is the one that leads to

¹ Hobbes, *The Art of Rhetoric*, III. 9. Both the notion and Hobbes' example derive from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* III. ix. 10. 'Easy learning is naturally pleasant to all, and words mean something, so that all words which make us learn something are most pleasant. Now we do not know the meaning of strange words, and proper terms we know already. It is metaphor, therefore, that above all produces this effect; for when Homer calls old age stubble, he teaches and informs us through the genus; for both have lost their bloom.'

Dr. Johnson's strictures on the mythology of *Lycidas*, and, ultimately, to Wordsworth's vain effort to be rid of his whole heritage of poetic language. It is a profound mistrust of the art of rhetoric that we see developing in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

Increasingly that once admired art is thought of as a cunning device, an art of deception. In the *Leviathan* Hobbes describes rhetoricians as egotistical deceivers who

have in their speeches, a regard to the common Passions, and opinions of men, in deducing their reasons; and make use of Similitudes, Metaphors, Examples and other tools of Oratory, to persuade their Hearers of the Utility, Honour, or Justice of following their advise.¹

His view is that no honest Counsellor ought to use

metaphoricall Speeches, tending to the Stirring up of Passion, (because such reasoning, and such expressions, are usefull only to deceive, or to lead him we Counsell towards other ends than his own).

With perfect consistency, we find him in *The Art of Rhetoric* advocating all the known tricks as a profitable study for lawyers and politicians, since, as he there tells us,

Rhetorick, is that Faculty, by which we understand what will serve our turn concerning any Subject to win belief in the hearer.²

There is a sharp contrast, implied by Hobbes throughout his treatment of the subject, between eloquence and all its tools on the one hand, and statements of facts and reasoned deductions from them on the other. In other words, rhetoric is contrasted with truth as he and his contemporaries understood it. The ideal set forth in Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*,³ of a use of language which would enable men to deliver 'so many things in so many words', dominated the age in its attempts to formulate a theory of prose style. Closely connected with this belief in a possible exact correspondence between words and things, was the value set in theory (though seldom in practice) upon brevity. Supposing truth to be simple and easily apprehended by man's reason, (if only reason can be disembarrassed from feeling), it will follow that the more shortly and barely facts and reasons are uttered, the better.

Robert South's view of 'brevity', expressed in a sermon advocating short prayers, is precisely that of Hobbes, whom he describes in the same sermon as 'the impious author of *Leviathan*'. South writes:

¹ *Leviathan*, Pt. II. c. 25.

² Hobbes, *The Art of Rhetoric*, Bk. I. ii.

³ 1667.

In Brevity of Speech a Man does not speak so much Words, as Things; Things in their precise and naked Truth; and stripped of their Rhetorical Mask, and their Fallacious Gloss: and therefore, in Athens they circumscribed the Pleadings of their Orators by a strict Law, cutting off Prologues and Epilogues, and Commanding them to an immediate Representation of the Case, by an impartial and succinct Declaration of meer Matter of Fact. And this was indeed to speak Things fit for a Judge to hear, because it argued the Pleader also a Judge of what was fit for him to speak.¹

The metaphor of the 'naked' truth occurs again in Baxter's *Gildas Silvianus* or *The Reformed Pastor*:²

Truth loves the Light, and is most beautiful when most naked. It is a sign of an envious enemy to hide the truth; and it is sign of an Hypocrite to do this under the pretence of revealing it: and therefore painted obscure Sermons (like painted Glass in the windows that keep out the light) are too oft the marks of painted Hypocrites. If you would not Teach men, what do you in the Pulpit? If you would, why do you not speak so as to be understood?

The advice to preachers, offered by so many divines at this time, either in books or treatises devoted to that purpose, or in their own sermons, is consciously directed against the survival of old practices. These men believe, as firmly as Dryden does, that they are living in a new and better time, in which new and better ways of expressing oneself are available. This is not, of course, the whole story. They also believe—as when have men not believed?—that they are living in particularly wicked and degenerate times. They cry out against the profligacy and atheism of Restoration England and agree in ascribing the evil very largely to 'the ingeneous author of a very bad book, I mean the *Leviathan*'.³ Sometimes, those of them who are not members of the Royal Society will hint a distrust also of the new reliance on experimental proof: South links the profligates with the experimenters in a sermon entitled (characteristically) *The Practice of Religion Enforced by Reason*:

It cannot but be a matter for just Indignation to all knowing and good Men, to see a Company of Lewd, Shallow brain'd Huffs, making Atheisms and Contempt of Religion the sole Badge and Character of Wit, Gallantry and true Discretion; and then, over their Pots, and Pipes, claiming and engrossing all these wholly to themselves; magisterially censuring the Wisdom of all Antiquity, scoffing at all Piety, and (as it were) new modelling the whole World. . . .

¹ *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions* (1st edition, 1679). *A Discourse against long Extemporate Prayers*.

² 1656, c. III. Sect. 1.

³ Tillotson, *Sermon On the Wisdom of Being Religious*.

The truth is these Persons . . . are of such a peculiar stamp of Impiety, that they seem to be a set of Fellows got together, and formed into a kind of *Diabolical Society*, for the finding out *new experiments* in Vice . . . obliging Posterity with unheard-of Inventions and Discoveries in Sin; resolving herein to admit of no other Measure of *good* and *evil*, but the Judgment of *Sensuality*, as those who prepare matters to their hands, allow no other Measure of the Philosophy and Truth of things, but the sole *Judgment of Sense*. And these (forsooth) are our great Sages, and those who must pass for the only shrewd, thinking and inquisitive men of the Age; and such as by a long, severe, and profound Speculation of Nature, have redeemed themselves from the *Pedantry* of being Conscientious, and living virtuously. . .

But although the preachers are aware of much wickedness around them, and suspect that it is more than is customary in the world, and although some of them may view the new philosophy with suspicion, yet they believe (though perhaps inconsistently) that there has been an intellectual advance of some kind.

'Without flattering the present Age', writes Gilbert Burnet in *A Discourse of Pastoral Care*, 'or any Persons now alive too much, it must be admitted that it' (that is, pulpit eloquence)

is brought of late to a much greater Perfection than it ever was before among us. . . . Our Language is much refined, and we have returned to plain Notions of simple and genuine Rhetorick.¹

The particular virtues of style (intimately connected with virtues of thought) upon which the age prided itself were plainness or clarity, and a virtue which they call either 'decency' or 'propriety'. Hobbes writes:

The virtues of a *Word* are two; the first, that it be *perspicuous*; the second, that it be *decent*; that is, neither *above* nor *below* the thing signified.²

This is the Augustan doctrine, for poetry no less than for prose; it was Dr. Johnson's opinion that 'Words too familiar or too remote defeat the purpose of the poet', although Dryden, we remember, was not so sure about the impropriety of 'remoteness'. The whole of his *Apology for Heroic Poetry and Poetic Licence*³ shows his uneasiness at the emasculating tendencies of the new doctrine. He concludes:

The sum of all depends on what before I hinted, that this boldness of expression is not to be blamed, if it be managed by the coolness and discretion which is necessary to a poet.

¹ 1692.

² 1677.

³ *The Art of Rhetoric*, Bk. III, ii.

But Dr. Johnson's distress at Shakespeare's 'dunniest smoke of Hell', 'blanket of the dark', and 'knife' casts its shadow before as we watch Augustan taste forming itself in the 1670's. Glanvill writes in *Concerning Preaching*:

I observe in some men's Preaching a certain sordidness, which though ignorant people may like as plain and familiar Preaching; yet 'tis such a familiarity as begets contempt. Such is the use of vulgar Proverbs, and homely similitudes, and rude and clownish phrases: These are indecencies of speech . . . and those who can be guilty of them have a certain clownishness of soul, that hath no taste of what is decorous and becoming.¹

The attacks on the stylistic habits of preachers often plainly refer to surviving fashions, transmitted from medieval times by such men as Donne and Andrews: for instance, 'dividing texts into devisibles and mincing them into single words',² or verbal wit; which John Eachard (*Grounds and Occasions of Contempt of the Clergy*) calls 'the lucky ambiguity of some word or sentence':

Oh! what a happiness it is and how much does a Youngster count himself beholding to his Stars, that should help him to such a taking Jest. And whereas there be so many thousand Words in the World, and that he should light upon the right one, that was so very much to his purpose, and, at the explosion, made such a goodly report.

Such verbal fireworks Glanvill denounces as 'witticisms', a word newly come into the language (the O.E.D. quotes Dryden's *Apology for Heroic Poetry* 1677 for the first example of its use). Glanvill makes an extremely interesting distinction between 'witticizing' and true wit:

There is a kind of witticizing which some men use in the pulpit which is by all means to be avoided; the subjects of a sermon are most serious, and ought to be suitably handled. We are to speak as the oracles of God, and as becomes his messengers and ambassadors; and how would it be for persons of that Character from Temporal Princes, to deliver their message in juggles and quibbles, in witticisms and flourishes. . . . I do not by this reprehend all wit whatsoever in Preaching, nor anything that is truly such: For true wit is a perfection in our faculties, chiefly in the understanding and imagination; wit in the understanding is a sagacity to find out the nature, relations and consequences of things; wit in the imagination is a quickness in the Phancy to give things proper Images; now the more of these in sermons, the more of judgment and spirit and life: without wit of these kinds preaching is dull and unedifying. . . . But the other, that which consists in inversions of sentences and playing with words, and the like, is vile and contemptible fooling.

¹ 1678.

² Joseph Glanvill, *Concerning Preaching*, 1678.

Here is a beautifully lucid description of the nature of wit, aptly describing the qualities most valued at this time and admirably achieved by its best prose writers. Here Glanvill seems to give considerable importance to 'Phancy' as he understands it, as the faculty whereby 'proper' images are discovered. But it is almost certain that, just as he mentions it after 'wit in the understanding, the sagacity to find out the nature, relations and consequences of things', so also he believes it to be second in importance. It is the function of 'wit in the understanding' to apprehend the truth, of wit in the imagination to communicate it. The former quality is above suspicion; but the latter, at this time, is frequently suspected. Robert South can assume the inferiority of 'fancy or imagination' (the two words were synonymous) to judgment, confidently enough to base an argument upon it. He is arguing that brevity in all kinds of discourse is a great virtue:

Most of the Writings and Discourses in the World are but Illustration and Rhetorick, which signifies as much as nothing to a Mind that is eager in pursuit after the Philosophical Causes and Truth of things. It is the work of the Fancy to *enlarge*, but of Judgment to *shorten* and *contract*; and therefore this must needs be as far above the other, as Judgment is a nobler Faculty than Fancy or imagination . . .

There is no doubt in the minds of these men that 'philosophical causes and the truth of things' are available to sense and reason.

All this new doctrine about style is closely connected with a new purpose which governs the practice of the preacher no less than of the natural philosopher. Men are to preach religion and morals (the two are scarcely distinguished) as they are to explore the secrets of nature, in order to be of use. The object of natural philosophy is less and less to unveil the final cause; it is more and more to apply knowledge to the control of the material world. Sir Thomas Browne wrote:

Every Essence, created or uncreated hath its final cause, and some positive end, both of its Essence and Operation. This is the cause I grope after in the works of Nature; on this hangs the Providence of God.¹

But when he writes like this, he shows himself as still belonging to the old world of thought, the world of the Scholastic Philosophers. Bacon, in *The Advancement of Learning*, pointed out another road:

For the handling of *finall causes* mixed with the rest in *Philosophicall enquiries*, hath intercepted the severe and diligent enquire of all *reall*

¹ 1642.

and *phiscall causes*, and given men occasion, to stay upon these *satisfactorie* and *specious causes*, to the great arrest and prejudice of further discoverie.

The road he pointed out led, as he knew it would, to the discovery of the behaviour of nature in order that she might be harnessed to man's needs:

For it is no more, but by following, and as it were, hounding Nature in her wanderings, to bee able to leade her afterwarde to the same place againe.

Just as the aim of the natural philosopher was to discover facts that could be tested and made use of (although of course the disinterested love of truth was also operative in the researches of many of them), so the preacher too, confined himself more and more to such moral truths as could be verified by experience and made use of in social life. Joseph Glanvill, in *Concerning Preaching*, defines the aims of preaching and handles its rules accordingly: 'The end of Preaching must be acknowledged to be the Instruction of the hearers in Faith and Good Life, in order to the Glory of God, and their present and future happiness. . . . I shall handle the rules of Preaching under these four heads. It ought to be plain, practical, methodical and affectionate.' He warns the preacher against becoming involved in expounding such doctrines as are 'speculative and nice': these he may let alone, 'but those that guide and incourage us in Virtue and Goodness, must be often explained and enforced'.

Locke, in *The Reasonableness of Christianity as Delivered in Scripture*, clearly implies that the truth or otherwise of the Christian revelation (truth, in the sense of correspondence with fact) is relatively unimportant. The importance of religion lies in its utility as a guide to morals:

It should seem, by the little that has hitherto been done in it, that 'tis too hard a task for unassisted reason, to establish morality in all its parts, upon its true foundation, with a clear and convincing light. And 'tis at least a surer and shorter way, to the apprehensions of the vulgar, and mass of mankind, that one manifestly sent from God, and coming with visible authority from Him, should, as a King and Lawmaker, tell them their duties; and require their obedience; than leave it to the long, and sometimes intricate deductions of reason, to be made out to them. Such trains of reasoning, the greatest part of mankind have neither the leisure to weigh; nor, for want of education and use, the skill to judge of. . . . Experience shows, that the knowledge of morality by meer natural light, (how agreeable soever it be to it) makes but a slow progress, and little advance in the world.

Religion is here seen as a substitute for moral philosophy. The 'knowledge of morality by meer natural light' is hard to reach, and most men have not the intelligence or the education to arrive at it. Revealed religion is recommended as a short cut, but Locke has no doubt that the same moral truths can, by those who have the time and the ability, be discovered by 'natural reason' as are inculcated by religion. This belief is shared by the preachers:

A Thing or Action is said to be morally Good or Evil, as it is agreeable or disagreeable to right Reason, or to a rational nature.¹

Tillotson's sermons afford the clearest example of the general tendency of the pulpit orator to address himself to the good sense of his hearers. The mere titles of his sermons are an indication of his attitude: *The Wisdom of being Religious*; *The Folly of Scoffing at Religion*; *The Advantages of Religion to Societies*; *The Precepts of Christianity not Grievous*.

These titles are taken from the *Fifty-Four Sermons and Discourses* published by Tillotson himself. In the Preface he gives an account of the fourfold 'Design of these Discourses':

First, To shew the unreasonableness of Atheism, and of scoffing at Religion; which I am sorry is so necessary to be done in this Age. . . .

Secondly, To recommend Religion to men from the great and manifold advantages which it brings both to publick Society and to particular persons. . . .

Thirdly, To represent the excellency, more particularly of the Christian Religion; and to vindicate the practice of it from the suspicion of those grievous troubles and difficulties which many imagine it to be attended withal. . . .

Fourthly, To persuade men to the practice of this holy Religion, from the great obligation which the profession of Christianity lays upon men to that purpose; and more particularly, from the glorious rewards of another life. . . .

Tillotson's preaching was directed more exclusively to the judgment of his hearers than was South's and, correspondingly, his style conformed more closely to the new doctrine.

The advocates of a change in prose style were right in supposing that imagery, and particularly metaphor, (in which the illustration is offered as identical with and not merely like the thing illustrated) is an instrument likely to affect the feelings and 'deceive the judgment'. An effective metaphor is an act of the imagination as Coleridge understood it; it 'modifies a series of thoughts by some predominant

¹ R. South, *Sermon preached at Westminster Abbey, April 8th, 1688. Text: Matt. xii. 12.*

thought or feeling'.¹ Both *vehicle* and *tenour* are changed by their union; the reader or audience responds imaginatively (not judicially) to the new concept thus created. In so far as South's own prose is metaphorical he failed to practise what he and his contemporaries advocated. He may have supposed that when (as in the following passage) he selected images from natural philosophy, he was restricting himself to fact, and therefore appealing to judgment; but, if so, he was mistaken.

Well then; the first Ingredient of a pious, and reverential Prayer, is a previous regulation of the Thoughts, as the text expresses it most emphatically: *Let not the Heart be hasty to utter anything before God*; that is, in other Words, let it not venture to throw out its crude, extemporary, sudden and misshapen Conceptions in the Face of infinite Perfection. Let not the Heart *conceive* and *bring forth* together. This is monstrous and unnatural. All Abortion is from Infirmary and Defect. And time is required to form the Issue of the Mind, as well as of the Body. The fitness or unfitness of the first Thoughts, cannot be judged of, but by reflection of the second: And be the Invention never so fruitful, yet in the Mind, as in the Earth, that which is cast into it, must lie hid and covered for a while, before it can be fit to shoot forth. These are the Methods of Nature, and it is seldom but the Acts of Religion conform to them.²

By identifying extemporary prayers with 'misshapen conceptions', things that are 'monstrous and unnatural', 'abortion', 'infirmary', 'defect', he arouses (as he meant to do) a disgust for them, and his 'pious and reverential prayer' is identified with the products of nature, thus compelling us to think of them as being like newly sprung flowers or flawless young creatures. The effect of South's imagery is no different in kind from the effect of Donne's imagery in a passage from Sermon IX in which, in a general argument for liturgical prayer, he inserts a passage in praise of that which is spontaneous:

That soule, that is accustomed to direct her selfe to God, upon every occasion, that, as a flowre at Sun-rising, conceives a Sense of God, in every beame of his, and spreads and dilates it selfe towards him, in a thankfulness, in every small blessing that he sheds upon her; that soule, that as a flowre at the Suns declining, contracts and gathers in, and shuts up her selfe as though she had received a blow, when soever she heares her Saviour wounded by an oath, or blasphemy, or execration; that soule, who, whatsoever string be stricken in her, base, or treble, her high or her low estate, is ever tun'd towards God, that soule prayes sometimes when it does not know that it prayes.³

¹ Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*.

² *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions*.

³ Sermon ix (*LXXX Sermons*).

The image here is unusually sensuous for Donne, it is set in deliberate contrast to an image in which liturgical prayer is identified with the orderly and acceptable payment of debts in the coinage of the realm, stamped with the king's head; Donne is juxtaposing two kinds of prayer both of which are good, the one ordered and prescribed, the other spontaneous and natural; for the latter he uses this image from nature. And, as with South's image, the reader's preconceptions about the beauty of flowers, and the propriety of their behaviour are a potent instrument with which the writer achieves his effect. If there is any difference between the emotional intensity of Donne's passage and South's, it is due to the stronger rhythms of Donne's prose. Rhythm and imagery, Coleridge believed, are equally 'the gift of imagination'. There is little said about prose rhythm by the advocates of the new prose, but in practice the change in both was equally striking. And, with regard to both, Tillotson's prose is more completely divorced from the past than South's, just as his conception of religion is more clearly representative of the new thought. The close relation between the new thought and the new style can be illustrated by juxtaposing passages from Donne and from Tillotson in which the subject matter is similar. Here, for instance, is a passage from each on the subject of atheism: Tillotson's is cool and reasoned, it is addressed to the judgment, whilst the patterned rhythmical passage from Donne is addressed to the imagination. Tillotson argues:

that the principles of Religion, the *belief of a God and another life*: by obliging men to be virtuous, do really promote their temporal happiness. And all the privilege that atheism pretends to, is to let men loose to vice, which is naturally attended with temporal inconveniences. And if this be true, then the atheist cannot pretend this Reason, (which is the only one I can think of) to dispute against Religion, much less to rally upon it viz. charity to mankind. For it is plain that it would be no kindness to any man, to be undeceived in these principles of Religion, supposing they were false. Because the principles of Religion are so far from hindring, that they promote a man's happiness even in this world; and as to the other world, there can be no inconvenience in the mistake: For when a man is not, it will be no trouble to him, that he was once deceived about these matters.¹

Thus Tillotson reasons, without images, without any marked rhythmical pattern, appealing to the common sense of his hearers. Donne on the other hand cries out against the atheist, using his characteristic incremental repetitions and all the devices of his

¹ Tillotson, *Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions*, second ed., 1673, p. III.

rhetoric to terrify any member of his congregation who may be that way inclined:

Poore intricated soule! Riddling, perplexed, labyrinthicall soule! Thou couldest not say, that thou beleevest not in God, if there were no God; Thou couldest not beleeve in God, if there were no God; If there were no God, thou couldest not speake, thou couldest not thinke, not a word, not a thought, no not against God; thou couldest not blaspheme the Name of God, thou couldest not swear, if there were no God: For, all thy faculties, how ever depraved, and perverted by thee, are from him; and except thou canst seriously beleeve, that thou art nothing, thou canst not beleeve that there is no God. If I should ask thee at a Tragedy, where thou shouldest see him that has drawn blood, lie weltring, and surrounded in his owne blood, Is there a God now? If thou couldst answer me, No, These are but Inventions, and Representations of men, and I believe a God never the more for this; If I should ask thee at a Sermon, where thou shouldest heare the Judgements of God formerly denounced, and executed, and re-denounced, and applied to present occasions, Is there a God now? If thou couldest answer me, No, These are but Inventions of State, to souple and regulate Congregations, and keep people in order, and I beleeve God never the more for this; Bee as confident as thou canst, in company; for company is the Atheists Sanctuary; I respit thee not till the day of Judgement, when I may see thee upon thy knees, upon thy face, begging of the hills, that they would fall downe and cover thee from the fierce wrath of God, to aske thee then, Is there a God now? I respit thee not till the day of thine own death, when thou shalt have evidence enough, that there is a God, though no other evidence but to finde a Devill, and evidence enough, that there is a Heaven, though no other evidence, but to feele Hell; To aske thee then, Is there a God now? I respit thee but a few houres, but six houres, but till midnight. Wake then; and then darke, and alone, Heare God aske thee then, remember that I asked thee now, Is there a God? and if thou darest, say No.¹

In the latter half of the seventeenth century prose tended to move away from poetry; and so for a time did verse, if by the word 'poetry' we understand the language of intuition and imagination, rather than of sense-perception and judgment. 'What the imagination seizes as Beauty must be Truth', Keats was to write. But, for a hundred years at least, it was thought that truth could only be discovered by the judgment, arranging and comparing the data offered to the senses. The utmost that the imagination had to do in the business was to decorate the findings of the judgment, so as to make them available to the weaker understanding of the common man.

¹ Sermon XLVIII (*LXXX Sermons*).

ABSALOM AND ACHITOPHEL: LITERARY AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

BY E. S. DE BEER

The personal allusions in *Absalom and Achitophel* aroused curiosity from the start. While a few of them were probably obvious to all readers some of them must have been unintelligible to almost all: in works of this class no writer can hit the mark with every shot; especially when his targets include not only the great and the notorious, but also second-rate public men and men only on the verge of public life. The first attempts at identification were no doubt made by purchasers of the poem, writing the names in the margins;¹ possibly manuscript keys were also circulated.² The first complete key to be printed appeared in the *Miscellany Poems*, 1716.³ But two commentaries of some importance had been published soon after the first publication of the poem. The first, by a nonconformist divine, Christopher Nesse, was *A Key (With the Whip) To open the Mystery & Iniquity of the poem called, Absalom & Achitophel*, and was published by 13 January 1682.⁴ Nesse is too violent and too acrimonious to give his points their full weight; he would have been wiser to have avoided verse; and his piece does not cover the whole of *Absalom*. But it is a valuable commentary on the poem; Nesse clearly had an expert knowledge of the Bible and a very satisfactory knowledge of contemporary politics. The second commentary is the anonymous *Absolon's IX Worthies: or, a Key to a late Book or Poem, Entitled A.B. & A.C.*, published by 10 March 1682;⁵ this is a series of abusive verses on the leading Whigs; their names are not given

¹ I have not seen any of these; Narcissus Luttrell's copy of the poem, with his notes, is preserved in the Huntington Library: Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: a bibliography*, 1939, p. 20. My indebtedness to Mr. Macdonald's bibliography will be obvious; it is essential for the systematic reading of Dryden, let alone more elaborate study.

² Part of a MS. key (from the British Museum) is reproduced by R. Garnett and E. Gosse, *English Literature*, 1906, iii. 148. It includes the impossible identification Caleb/Radnor.

³ ii. 36-7 (Macdonald, p. 78). I have not seen a copy of Macdonald's no. 12 l.

⁴ Macdonald, no. 203. The piece incidentally shows how rapidly the second edition (Macdonald, no. 12 e i) had come into circulation. Scott and Saintsbury (see below) give extracts from this and the following piece.

⁵ Macdonald, no. 204.

and the allusions are generally obscure. The other contemporary poems on *Absalom* are of no value for the explanation of the allusions.

The first modern commentator on *Absalom* was Sir Walter Scott. The most important of the historical commentaries are those of Scott as revised by Dr. G. Saintsbury;¹ and of W. D. Christie as revised by (Sir) Charles Firth;² and of the literary commentaries that by Professor A. W. Verrall, in his *Lectures on Dryden*.³ While the modern commentators have covered much of the ground their work shows two defects: they have all accepted the Key of 1716, even when recognizing that it is unsatisfactory; and they have not paid sufficient attention to the relationship between *Absalom* and Dryden's other writings. For the modern reader there is a further defect, that they do not discuss the biblical nomenclature, an essential element in the poem.⁴

There is little approaching *Absalom* in merit or style in Dryden's earlier writings; the only piece that comes at all near it is *Mac Flecknoe*.⁵ Its distinguishing characteristic among satirical poems is

¹ In Dryden, *Works*, 1882-93, vol. ix.

² In Dryden, *Stanzas on the death, etc.*, 5th ed., 1901 (Clarendon Press; on cover, 'Dryden: Select Poems').

³ 1914; pp. 47-91. Mr. M. Van Doren in *The Poetry of John Dryden*, 1920, deals more generally with the poetical style and versification.

⁴ Dryden's political philosophy and his views on current issues have never been satisfactorily examined; the most interesting notice is that (pp. 127-43) by Miss M. E. Hartsock, in 'Dryden's plays: a study in ideas' in *Seventeenth Century Studies*, 2nd ser., ed. R. Shafer, 1937, pp. 71-178 (University of Cincinnati). An article by M. Y. Hughes, *Philological Quarterly*, ix (1927), 335-50 contains such surprising statements as that Dryden asserts that he was a Trimmer in the *Vindication of the Duke of Guise*.

Dryden was not primarily concerned with politics and probably never formed any systematic theory of politics; on the other hand he frequently expressed himself on the issues of the day. From the Restoration to the Revolution he was a king's man, eventually an extreme Tory, rather similar in outlook to L'Estrange, the Norths, or Jeffreys, but carried still further by his conversion to Roman Catholicism. For his more general views it is necessary to examine almost the whole mass of his writings, the exact translations alone excepted (even here the selection of pieces for translation may be significant). Absolute consistency is not to be expected from a man whose literary life extended over more than forty years and through several great upheavals; but Dryden is always liable to be carried away by his immediate concern; and, while vigorous in expression, is never sufficiently analytic. Hence there are a number of irreconcilable passages in his writings; even such a comparatively short passage as the opening of the Postscript to his translation of Maimbourg's *History of the League* shows his inability to develop one line of thought.

Until about 1680 Dryden seems to have accepted Hobbit views without much consideration; later he proclaims his allegiance to Divine Right; but his strong Pyrrhonism interfered with his acceptance of the theory. His Pyrrhonism ultimately led him to an almost complete disbelief in all political activity.

⁵ Accepting the date 1678: Macdonald, pp. 28-9.

its breadth of handling, its epic quality. Within the general frame there are passages on markedly diverse themes, but all are treated in the same elevated style; there is plenty of hard hitting, but no cheap triumph; the poem is effortless and genial; whether one approves or not of the cause adopted by Dryden, this is a fair and noble exposition of it.¹ One element Dryden had thoroughly mastered, the heroic couplet; almost everything else in the poem is new.

Yet Dryden's writings show why he was ready to write *Absalom* when the moment came. He had for some years been hoping to obtain leisure to write an heroic poem and had evidently given much thought to such a production. The evidence is supplied by the dedication of *Aureng-Zebe*, written about the beginning of 1676:

Your Lordship [Mulgrave] has been long acquainted with my design; the subject of which you know is great, the story English, and neither too far distant from the present age, nor too near approaching it. Such it is in my opinion, that I could not have wished a nobler occasion to do honour by it to my King, my country and my friends; most of our ancient nobility being concerned in the action.²

Later, in the dedication of *Juvenal*, 1693, Dryden gives as his chosen subjects the Black Prince and King Arthur; from the above passage it is probable that at this time he was considering the former;³ he may however for a time have been attracted by a more nearly contemporary subject. Lee, addressing him in a poem prefixed to *The State of Innocence*, which was published in 1677,⁴ writes:

On then, O mightiest of th' inspired Men,
Monarch of Verse; new Themes employ thy Pen.
The Troubles of Majestick CHARLES set down:
Not David vanquish'd more to reach a Crown:
Praise him, as Cowley did that Hebrew King,
Thy Theme's as great, do thou as greatly sing.⁵

¹ There is one reservation, the secular attitude; one can imagine a statement giving more value to the divine right basis of the monarchy. It is curious that Tories like Anthony Wood accepted *Absalom* so uncritically; the poem leaves unmentioned the loyalty to the king of the great mass of the Anglican clergy; on the other hand it contains a general sneer at priests, regardless of their denomination.

² Quoted from Malone's edition of Dryden's *Prose Works*; I have generally used Malone or Ker for the prose. The 'Guardian Angel' (*Absalom*, l. 853) is perhaps a product of Dryden's concern with the epic: see below, p. 304 n. 3.

³ The Triumph of the Black Prince was the subject of Verrio's decoration for St. George's Hall in Windsor Castle, painted in 1680-2.

⁴ The piece was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1674; Lee's poem may therefore precede the dedication of *Aureng-Zebe*.

⁵ Quoted from the 1735 edition of Dryden's *Dramatick Works*; I have used this edition for the Plays.

Doubtless the Black Prince was more suitable; but in the dedication of *All for Love*, 1678, Dryden shows that he had given some thought to the later subject:

The Honour and Gallantry of the Earl of *Lindsey* is so illustrious a Subject, that 'tis fit to adorn an Heroick Poem; for he was the Proto-Martyr of the Cause, and the Type of his unfortunate Royal Master.

The early dedications are very important in this connection; while in the dedication of Juvenal Dryden is mainly interested in the 'machinery' of the heroic poem, in these pieces he elevates contemporary themes to the heroic level. They are prose hymns, a judicious blending of panegyric and characterisation, written with glowing heat; they are very different from the later dedications, in which the compliments appear strained.¹ The most striking is that of *Amboyna*, to Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, written shortly after his retirement from office. Here a contemporary theme is treated in the grand manner, Clifford's retirement, the inevitable sequel of his conversion to Roman Catholicism, being regarded as a voluntary resignation, virtue, true to itself, quitting worldly honours; religion is not mentioned, the nearest reference to the Test Act being a general phrase, 'the iniquity of the times'. Naturally Dryden had to tread carefully here to avoid offending either Clifford or public opinion; but the treatment appears to be due mainly to literary preference.

Dryden had also treated contemporary history in verse, most notably in *Annus Mirabilis*. But he describes this correctly as 'An Historical Poem'. It is a magnificent chronicle; while 'the Actions and Actors are as much Heroick as any Poem can contain', the treatment is in the main detailed and precise; excellent as many passages are, there is a general want of grandeur, made more noticeable by the too frequent conceits. In marked contrast are the 'Verses to Her Highness the Dutches'² prefixed to the poem. In the opening lines Dryden celebrates the duchess's victory over herself in allowing her husband to go into battle:

MADAM,
When for our sakes your *Heroe* you resign'd
To swelling Seas and every faithless wind;

¹ The most interesting from this point of view are those of *Tyrannick Love*, 1670, to Monmouth; *An Evening's Love*, 1671, to Newcastle; *The Conquest of Granada*, 1672, to the Duke of York; *Amboyna*, 1673, to Clifford; and *The State of Innocence*, 1677, to the Duchess of York. These pieces have an *élan* similar to that of the heroic plays to which most of them are attached.

² The first Duchess of York.

When you releas'd his Courage and set free
 A Valour fatal to the Enemy,
 You lodg'd your Countries cares within your breast,
 (The mansion where soft love should only rest :)
 And e're our Foes abroad were overcome,
 The noblest conquest you had gain'd at home.
 Ah, what concerns did both your Souls divide!
 Your Honour gave us what your Love deni'd:
 And 'twas for him much easier to subdue
 Those Foes he fought with, than to part from you.¹

The dedications are nearer to the artificiality of the heroic plays than to the natural manner of *Absalom*; this passage, thanks perhaps to the occasion for it, while still too dramatic, is again more natural.²

Some months before the publication of *Absalom* Dryden had produced a political pamphlet, *His Majesties Declaration Defended*, which was published in June 1681.³ The experience gained in writing this emerges in *Absalom* as close contact with actual events, the solid basis for the poetical treatment; so that, when the time came for a political pamphlet in verse—on one side the true character of the poem—Dryden was fully equipped for writing it.⁴

The heroic plays contributed a little beyond practice in versification. Their settings are widely divergent in place and time but there is very little local colour to be found in them;⁵ there is however a sort of generalization; marked English features are usually avoided.⁶ Dryden turned this to account in *Absalom*; while local colour is

¹ I have used Sargeant's edition for all quotations from the poems and their preliminary matter.

² It should be compared with such things as Isabella's speeches at the end of *The Conquest of Granada*; the later lines are more conventional. An example of how a sensible woman could see her position in terms of the drama is provided by the *Memoirs of Queen Mary II* (ed. R. Doebner, 1886); it is Dryden's drama at that.

³ The attribution is I think beyond question; I have read the piece, but not examined it carefully; it has I think little direct relation to *Absalom*. Dryden may have written other pamphlets at this time, but so far nothing else has been found that is likely to be by him.

⁴ *Absalom* should be compared with *The Duke of Guise*, which was written probably only a few months later. It is unlikely that the play reached more than a small audience and comparatively few readers. Its disadvantages as a method of attack are shown by the lengthy *Vindication* which Dryden was compelled to produce. The parallel had carried further than Dryden had intended; and the play is littered with too much of the conventional machinery of tragedy.

⁵ But sufficient for Dryden's purposes. One specimen, Melesinda's suttee, is notably false; but Dryden has no knowledge of the mode of life of Mohammedan women. It must be remembered that the actors wore very little in the way of distinctive costume when playing exotic parts.

⁶ The characters in *Aureng-Zebe* are allowed plenty of classical allusions, but these were part of the ordinary poetic diction of the time (the Mexicans in *The Indian Emperor* are I think free from them).

provided, apart from the nomenclature, only by four or five Biblical and three non-Biblical words;¹ the use of the parallel helped him to detach the poem from too great detail, either of character or of incident. Two of the plays, *Tyrannick Love* and *The Conquest of Granada*, contain passages on parliament; that in the second piece anticipates a passage in *Absalom*.² The philosophic arguments in *The State of Innocence*, curious as they are, also prepared the ground for part of *Absalom*.

The satirical characters in *Absalom* were an almost completely new departure for Dryden. Very little in the way of formal characters appears in the plays. Those of the four princes in *Aureng-Zebe* are too jejune to be of any interest; the only one of any importance is that of Thersites in *Troilus and Cressida*:

Here comes *Thersites*,
Who feeds on *Ajax*: yet loves him not, because he cannot love.
But as a *Species*, differing from Mankind,
Hates all he sees; and rails at all he knows;
But hates them most, from whom he most receives,
Disdaining that his Lot should be so low,
That he shou'd want the Kindness which he takes.³

But characters were common in the satirical verse of the time; one may note especially two in the third part of *Hudibras*,⁴ the series in Mulgrave's *Essay on Satire*; ⁴ and a remarkable character of Buck-

¹ Sheekle (391), Sabbath (588, 913), Messiah (728), Sons of Belial (598); Rabbins (104), a non-Biblical form of a New Testament word, and the non-Biblical adjective Rabinical (658); Abbethdin (188), Sanhedrin or Sanhedrins (390, 523, 787, 878, 902, 920, 976), Sagan (866). Dryden probably acquired two of these last from T. Godwin, *Moses and Aaron: Civil and Ecclesiastical Rites, Used by the ancient Hebrews*, a general companion to the Bible first published in 1625. Thus: 'as in the *Civil Consistories*, consisting of *seventy* Judges, which was the supreme Court, there were two sate as Chief, namely, one whom they termed *Nasi*, *The Lord Chief Justice*; and the other whom they termed *Abbeth din*, the *Father of the Senate*: so in the *Ecclesiastical Consistory* the *High Priest* and his *Sagan*, or second *High-Priest*, sate chief there'; 'The senior of these *seventy* [judges] was called *Ab beth din*, the *Father of the Judgment-Hall*'; 'The *High-Priest* and his *Sagan*, resembled our *Bishop* and his *Suffragan*': quoted from 10th ed., 1671, pp. 18, 181, 191. Godwin attributes the establishment of the Sanhedrin to Jehoshaphat; and the 'Sagan of Jerusalem' appears to be a hopelessly false conception historically. Dryden presumably had a good knowledge of the Bible and there would be no need for him to do any special reading.

² *Tyrannick Love*, act 1 (ed. 1735, ii. 402-3); 2 *Conquest*, act 1, sc. ii (*ibid.*, iii. 108-9). While there was a senate in Rome, the first passage clearly alludes to contemporary English affairs; Dryden supplies Granada with a senate only in the one passage; it has no connection with the action of the play.

³ Act ii, sc. iii.

⁴ In Canto ii; they are very different from those of *Hudibras* and *Ralpho* in Part i.

⁵ For the identifications see Mr. Maurice Irvine in *Studies in Philology*, xxxiv (1937), 533-51.

ingham in a piece probably dating from 1673, 'Upon the Proroguing of the Parliament':

a . . . Peer,
 Who neither Roundhead is, nor Cavalier?
 But of some medley-cut, some ill-shap'd Brat,
 Would fain be something if he knew but what.
 For Commonwealth he vogues himself to be,
 And by and by for Abs'lute Monarchy:
 Then neither likes; but some new knick-knack found,
 Not Fish, not Flesh, not square, and yet not round.
Venetian Model pleases him to night,
 To morrow morning *France* is in the right.
 Thus, he, like Butterflies, much flutter makes;
 Sleeps of one Judgment, of another wakes.
 Zealous at morn, he will a Bishop make,
 Yet before night all Bishops down he'll take.
 He all things is, but yet to nothing true;
 All old things hates, nor can endure the new.¹

Absalom is not the culmination, nor even an outcome, of previously existing tendencies in Dryden's writings; it was far too new and original, far too much the product of a special occasion. But it was not an improvisation of genius; Dryden had, more or less by chance, fully equipped his mind for the task to which he had suddenly to devote his powers.

The parallel between David and Absalom and Charles II and Monmouth had already been exploited by other writers before Dryden took it up.² Besides the literary benefit already mentioned it had other more obvious advantages: Dryden could write more freely about David than about Charles II; and his victims could not take action against him without acknowledging the likeness of their portraits. The selection of names is interesting. There are two main groups, the Davidean and the Old Testament non-Davidean; and two miscellaneous names, the non-Biblical Annabella (l. 34) and the New Testament Stephen (643); these all apply to specific persons. There are also some general allusions, as to Adam, Aaron, and Samson, where no modern parallel is intended.³

¹ *Poems on Affairs of State*, vol. iii, 1704, pp. 54-5. The rest of the passage is a denunciation, not a character.

² Professor Richard F. Jones, in *Modern Language Notes*, xlii (1931), 211-8, 'The originality of *Absalom and Achitophel*', shows that the parallel was in common use in the seventeenth century; and was more closely applied when Monmouth emerged in 1680.

³ The place-names present little difficulty. Hebron is Scotland throughout (see

ABSALOM AND ACHITOPHEL: LITERARY NOTES 305

The Davidean group consists of David, Michal (11), Absalom, Amnon (39), Ishbosheth (58), Achitophel, Shimei (585), Bathsheba (710), Barzillai (817), Zadoc (864), Adriel (877), Hushai (888), and Amiel (899). Of these only David, Michal, Absalom, and Achitophel, were essential to the story.¹ Among the rest Shimei (Bethel) and Barzillai (Ormond) are particularly fortunate. Hushai has too marked a course to be altogether satisfactory for Laurence Hyde; the selection was due to his being 'David's friend' (2 Samuel xv. 37; xvi. 16; see also 1 Chronicles xxvii. 33). Zadoc appears not to have been high priest until the time of Solomon,² but is more prominent than Abiathar in the history of Absalom; the nearness of the name to Sancroft may have helped the selection. The selection of Adriel, a son-in-law of Saul (1 Samuel xviii. 19; 2 Samuel xxi. 8) for Mulgrave seems inexplicable; Amiel (Seymour) presumably refers to the father of the loyal Machir (2 Samuel xvii. 27); in both cases the sound of the name is perhaps important.

The non-Davidean group consists of Pharaoh (281), Zimri (544), Balaam, Caleb, and Nadab (574-5), Jonas (581), Corah (632), Agag, with Samuel and Saul (676-7), Issachar (738), and Jotham (882). Of these Pharaoh is obvious. Jotham (Halifax) and Issachar (Thynne) are singularly happy; the former, like his representative, makes a notable speech on the succession to the crown (Judges ix. 7-20); the latter is 'a strong ass' (Genesis xlix. 14).³ Jonas (Jones) is chosen for his name. Corah is due to his history (Numbers xvi); there is no special resemblance between him and Oates, and yet the selection seems thoroughly appropriate. Zimri has provoked some discussion;⁴ there are two men of this name, one the paramour of Cozbi,

Firth); Gath (264) is presumably the Spanish Netherlands; Jordan the seas surrounding England. Solymaeon (503) is non-Biblical. Hydra (541) and Hybla (697) are classical allusions, but too commonplace to disturb the general effect; the same applies to Muse, meaning either poet (828, 877, 878) or poetic inspiration (854); a veiled reference to Phaethon is also of little consequence. Two or three expressions are perhaps profane in so far as the poem deals with what used to be termed sacred history: 'inspired by some diviner Lust' (19); 'Each house receives him as a Guardian God' (735) (but note Godwin on Teraphim, 10th ed., pp. 170-1); 'B' unequal Fates and Providences crime' (834). [The Guardian Angel (853) was derived from Daniel and was to be one of the machines of the Christian epic: 'Discourse of Satire' in *Essays*, ed. Ker, ii. 34-7.

¹ David's Brother (353, etc.) is an intruder into the Biblical story and jars on the reader.

² Nesse raises this objection.

³ Firth points this out. Dryden mentions Issachar in *The Spanish Friar*, III. i: 'You make us Lay-men of the Tribe of Issachar. You make Asses of us, to bear your Burthens'.

⁴ J. Q. Wolf in *Modern Language Notes*, xlvii (1932), 97-9, 'A note on Dryden's Zimri'.

the Midianitish woman (Numbers xxv. 6-8, 14-15), the other a usurper of the throne of Israel (1 Kings xvi. 9-20). The author of *Absalons IX Worthies* refers to the former, and commentators have recalled Buckingham's misconduct with the countess of Shrewsbury. But that, bad as it was, had rather receded by 1681,¹ and the more romantic circumstances of the disguised countess attending the duel and the blood-stained shirt belong to eighteenth century legend rather than to seventeenth century history. The other Zimri was captain of half the chariots of Elah when he rose against him and slew him; Buckingham was Master of the Horse when, in 1674, on being questioned by the house of commons, he was considered by Charles II to have betrayed his counsels. But more important is the almost proverbial 'Had Zimri peace that slew his master?' (2 Kings ix. 31); the restlessness of the sitter perhaps determined the selection of the name to be attached to the portrait.²

The non-Biblical Annabel is simply Anne, duchess of Monmouth. Stephen is at first glance the Protomartyr; but there is probably a reference to the Protestant Joiner, Stephen Colledge, sentenced to death for high treason on 18 August 1681. Two of the witnesses against him, Dugdale and Turberville, had previously testified against Lord Stafford—who could or need examine their trustworthiness?³

Commentators on *Absalom* have always relied for identifications on the 'Key' published in 1716 in the *Miscellany Poems*; they have never seriously questioned its authority. In its favour is the fact that the book was published by Dryden's publisher, Tonson, within a comparatively short period of Dryden's death. On the other hand the identification of Agag as Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey does not make sense,⁴ and no attempt is made to identify Amnon. While most of the identifications in the Key are correct, some are wrong and some are open to discussion.

Amnon's murder is generally explained by references to the assault on Sir John Coventry in 1670 and the killing of a beadle near Whetstone Park in 1671 (although there is no chronicler to rival Pepys or

¹ There is a possible allusion to it in *The Spanish Friar*, iv, i: Lorenzo: 'What, taken away a Man's Wife, and kill him too! The Wickedness of this old Villain', etc.

² There may also be a purely literal conceit: if the rank of Monmouth and Shaftesbury in the party is shown by A for Absalom and Achitophel, then Buckingham's is equally clearly defined.

³ See also l. 1012: 'Against themselves their witnesses will Swear'; Turberville was also one of the witnesses against Shaftesbury on 24 November of this year, a few days after the publication of *Absalom*.

⁴ So Verrall.

Luttrell for the years from 1669 to 1678, it is fairly certain that Monmouth was not concerned in any other homicide in that period). In both these crimes Monmouth had, or was reputed to have had, a share; while the beadle was nameless, Coventry's remarks on the king's interest in actresses might easily have been considered by Monmouth to be a reflection on his mother. But if the word murder is not pressed there is perhaps a better explanation possible.

The Biblical Amnon, a son of David, having ravished Absalom's sister Tamar, was murdered by Absalom. Monmouth had a uterine sister Mary, who married first William Sarsfield (a brother of the gallant Patrick Sarsfield) and secondly, in 1676, one William Fanshawe. Monmouth had taken some interest in his sister's affairs and had tried to obtain for her a fair share of Sarsfield's property; but he apparently disliked her second marriage; it was noticed that he was not standing as godfather to Fanshawe's daughter in November 1677,¹ and in the same month he wrote to the Lord Lieutenant apparently surrendering any claims on Sarsfield's property.² Fanshawe appears to have been dependent on sinecures and pensions from the king; the loss of Monmouth's patronage was no doubt detrimental to his chances of obtaining further grants. Monmouth's reasons for disapproving of the marriage are unknown; but Fanshawe was probably a libertine and was highly undesirable as a husband;³ and on 12 July 1681 he was deprived of his office as a Master of Requests 'for talking little less than treason upon all occasions that he can'.⁴ Nothing else in which Monmouth was involved fits the Biblical allusion so nearly; but some quarrel with one of his half-brothers is also possible.⁵

Several problems are presented by ll. 569-76. Balaam, Caleb, and Nadab, are all peers. Balaam is always identified as Lord Huntingdon, about whom comparatively little is known. *Absalons IX Worthies* gives '*Priapus-Balaam . . . Sprouted of Royal Stem in ancient dayes*'; Huntingdon no doubt had several royal ancestors, but his royal descent was not particularly noteworthy. Nesse interprets the epithet 'well-hung' in the same way; Firth gives an alternative:

¹ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Bath MSS.*, ii. 158.

² *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1677-8, p. 469. For information about Monmouth's sister see the *Calendars*, 1673-81; A. Fea, *King Monmouth*, 1902, pp. 110-1, 403-6. Her father was Theobald Taaffe, earl of Carlingford.

³ *Bath MSS.*, 158, 162, 165.

⁴ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Ormonde MSS.*, New Ser., vi. 98.

⁵ Perhaps Charles FitzCharles, earl of Plymouth ('Don Carlos'), who died at Tangier in 1680. The circumstances of William Sarsfield's death are not traceable.

voluble, fluent. There is perhaps a *double entendre*; the latter meaning obviously belongs to the Biblical Balaam. Forde Lord Grey (of Wark) is a possible alternative; he does not appear to have had any outstanding royal descent; on the other hand he appears to have been an able parliamentarian and was certainly notorious for his misconduct.¹

Absalon's IX Worthies is even more obscure for Caleb:

O'th ancient race of *Jewish* Nobles come,
Whose Title never lay in *Christendome*.

This presumably means that he was of Scottish or Irish descent; but the author was perhaps guessing in the dark. Nesse identifies Caleb as Essex, but fails to see to what 'cold' refers, unless to his being too old to have any more children. The Key gives Lord Grey, who certainly was not 'cold'; Essex is almost certainly the correct interpretation; the resemblance of his family name, Capel, to Caleb, and his high moral character, both make the identification probable.

Nesse interprets Nadab as Lord Howard of Escrick, but fails to find any relevancy in either of the two Nadabs of the Bible (1 King xv. 25-6; Leviticus x. 1). In *Absalon's IX Worthies* he appears as:

Prophane *Nadab*, that hates all Sacred things
And on that score abominateth Kings.
With *Mahomet* Wine he damneth; with intent
T'erect his *Paschal*-Lambs-Wool-Sacrament.

There appears to be no satisfactory explanation of the last line, any more than of Dryden's equivalent, 'Who made new Porridge for the Paschal Lamb'. Dryden's epithet 'canting' implies that Nadab was attached to the nonconformists;² and in the line quoted he may allude to some attack on the Prayer Book rather than to simple blasphemy.³

Agag has always been identified as Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, who was found dead on 17 October 1678 and who was commonly believed to have been murdered. Dryden's lines are:

And *Corah* might for *Agag's* murther call,
In terms as course as *Samuel* us'd to *Saul*.

Corah is Oates. The difficulty is obvious: greatly as Godfrey's violent death helped Oates's rise, Oates certainly did not appeal to anyone

¹ The *Dictionary of National Biography* gives as authority for his ability as a speaker a reference to Burnet that I cannot trace.

² See *D.N.B.* for Howard as a preacher; but the identification of the preacher with Howard of Escrick does not seem to be fully established.

³ Dryden appears to be counter-attacking the nonconformists who described the Church services as 'porridge': for this use see *O.E.D.*

in authority for his removal, much less for his murder; there is nothing to show that he had any direct part in Godfrey's death and it is extremely unlikely that he was an accessory of any kind to it. A far more likely identification is with Sir William Scroggs. As Lord Chief Justice Scroggs had presided at the trial of Sir George Wakeman on 18 July 1679, and, in accordance with the evidence, had summed up in his favour;¹ Wakeman was duly acquitted. The result was a shower of abuse on Scroggs; and in due course Oates and Bedloe presented to the Council 'Articles of high misdemeanour' against him; Scroggs had no difficulty in answering them, and on 21 January 1680 the king and Council declared themselves satisfied with his reply.² It is to Oates's articles against Scroggs that Dryden alludes;³ they are compared with Samuel's utterances in 1 Samuel xv.⁴

Solutions of the minor problems of *Absalom* have a value not merely historical; they help to give the measure of Dryden's wit and to show the nature of his task and one of the reasons for his success. His fluency is controlled by his matter, in his case generally a gain; the poem always keeps to public affairs, without space for conventional elaboration or for private rancour.⁵ Dryden was later to find his proper field, the verse translations, where again he was kept within certain limits by his originals. They show an advance in technical accomplishment; meanwhile a political clash had provoked him to display a quality that here reaches its acme in his writings, his vigour.

¹ Scroggs appears to have been an upright judge, but a man of coarse character, and with a brutal tongue. In the Popish Plot trials, however, allowance must be made for his sincere belief that all Roman Catholics held certain pernicious principles. The *D.N.B.* article is very unsatisfactory; there is a good account of his character as a judge in (Sir) John Pollock, *The Popish Plot*, 1903, pp. 354-60.

² At the end of 1680 an attempt was made to impeach Scroggs, but proceedings were stopped by the dissolution of the Oxford parliament.

³ They are reprinted, with Scroggs's answer, in Howell's *State Trials*, viii. 163-74.

⁴ There appears to be no further allusion to Cromwell, who figures as Saul in *Absalom*, l. 57.

⁵ It is also almost free from the vindictiveness against the Whigs which disfigures Dryden's writings in the next few years; but traces of it appear in the passage from l. 914 to the end. The word 'lenitives' (l. 926) recurs in the Epilogue to *The Duke of Guise*, in which the assistance of Jack Ketch is invoked.

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S 1853 PREFACE

By H. W. GARROD

The two poetical events of 1853 were the *Poems* of Matthew Arnold and the *Poems* of Alexander Smith. Matthew Arnold's book was prefaced by an essay which ranks as one of the classics of English literary criticism. 'I doubt', says Mr. Saintsbury, 'whether he ever wrote better, either in sense or in style.'¹ Arnold relied a good deal at this time on the sympathy and judgment of Froude. Froude admired the *Poems* of 1853—'*Sohrab and Rustum*', he writes to Clough, 'is to my taste all but "perfect"'.² But he was against a Preface. 'He rather discourages from a preface', Arnold writes, 'but I shall try my hand at it, at any rate, I think'.³ And on 10 October 'The Preface is done', he tells Clough—'there is a certain *Geist* in it, I think, but it is far less *precise* than I had intended. How difficult it is to write prose!'⁴ He had, in fact, never written prose before. When, two and a half years later, he became professor of Poetry at Oxford, he owed his election to his poetry—and to the Preface to the *Poems* of 1853.

Froude, when he 'discounselled from a preface', had seen, not the Preface, but the *Poems*. He thought the wine good enough to need no bush. In poems that call for a preface there is usually something which wants explaining away. In the *Poems* of 1853 the only thing that wanted explaining away was what was not there. Arnold had left out *Empedocles on Etna*; and he did not want the world to draw false conclusions about his reason for doing so. 'It has not been excluded', he writes, 'in deference to the opinion which many critics of the present day appear to entertain against subjects chosen from distant times and countries; against the choice, in short, of any subjects but modern ones'. Of these 'many critics' he names none; but he quotes one, a writer in *The Spectator* (2 April 1853), whom he calls 'an apparently intelligent critic'. The writer was, as luck would have it, the editor of *The Spectator* himself, Robert Stephen Rintoul; who,

¹ *History of Criticism*, iii, 516.

² *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, p. 127.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

when the volume of 1853 appeared, took his revenge, 'attacking' the book 'elaborately and rather méchamment'.¹

When he reprinted his Preface in 1854, Matthew Arnold changed 'apparently intelligent' to 'intelligent'; and he added a footnote to the effect that, in quoting *The Spectator*, he was not quoting anything which had been said in that journal in criticism of his own poems. But Rintoul was not the only journalist whom the Preface criticised. Another was J. M. Ludlow. Ludlow is nowhere named in the Preface. But he is 'the modern critic' who is there² said not only to 'permit a false practice', but 'absolutely' to 'prescribe false aims'. Not much, I should suppose, is remembered about Ludlow today. A Christian socialist, and a friend of Tom Hughes, he edited in 1848, with F. D. Maurice, *Politics for the People*, and in 1863, with David Masson, a shortlived literary journal, *The Reader*. In 1853, he would seem, if we may believe Arnold, to have been associated with the *North British Review*.³ 'I am quite vexed', Arnold writes to his sister, on 31 October, 1853, 'that Mary Babery (entirely without my knowledge) should have proposed William's asking Ludlow to review me [i.e. to review the *Poems* of 1853]. I would never ask anyone to review me (Froude proposed it), and to ask Ludlow who—I believe—is the author of a precious piece of cant in the N. British, which I have attacked in the preface, would be preposterous'.

In May 1853 the *North British Review*⁴ had printed an article entitled *Glimpses of Poetry*, reviewing together the poems of 'A' and *The Morlas*, *A Poem*, by 'V'. 'V' was Caroline Clive—to-day I do not suppose that her name means for most of us any more than her initial. The reviewer shows rather more tenderness to 'V' than to 'A'. But of *The Strayed Reveller* he says some gracious things; though even of his praise some parts must have been distasteful to Arnold. *The Forsaken Merman*, for example, is commended; with the proviso, however, that it 'recalls certain poems of Tennyson rather too vividly'. *The New Sirens*, again, 'more than recalls Mrs. Browning'. In general, 'A's' poetic quality is allowed. But *Empedocles* is pronounced 'an utter mistake'. Its author 'constantly disappoints us'; and he will continue to do so unless hereafter he can manage to show 'less of aversion to action in all its forms, greater sympathy with the

¹ *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold*, p. 22. The cavils of *The Spectator* are discounted beforehand in *Letters*, i, p. 32.

² *Poems of Matthew Arnold*, 1840-1867; ed. A. T. Quiller Couch, p. 8.

³ *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold*, p. 20.

⁴ XIX., pp. 209-18.

wants of the present generation'. As it is, there are many who 'turn away contemptuously from the self-complacent reverie, and refined indolence, which too often disfigure his pages'. 'Grave seniors may hint at the propriety of rigid adherence to classic models . . . But in spite of all that has been said, or can be said, the poet whose verse comes bounding over the soul, who is constantly in the thoughts and language of youth, must be he who has felt the difficulties, and perhaps solved the problems, of the present age'.

Here, I supposed, when I first read these sentences, was 'the precious piece of cant' of which Arnold speaks in the letter to his sister; and that these sentences, and others like them, were in his mind when he wrote his 1853 Preface is, I think, obvious. He read the review when it appeared; and was curious about its authorship. 'There is an article on me', he writes to his mother,¹ 'in the last *North British* . . . Can it be by [J. S.] Blackie?'. I am disposed to think that the writer was, in fact, Ludlow—at least it is not difficult to detect in the article the accent of Christian socialism, and an ethical temper suited to the friend of Maurice and Hughes. I fancy that Ludlow wrote, not only this review, but yet another, which appeared in the *North British* in the following August. In August the *North British* reviewed, in one article, the *Poetics* of E. S. Dallas and the *Poems* of Alexander Smith. From this review the Preface of 1853 quotes—it in fact misquotes—a single sentence; and to the refutation of it devotes a whole paragraph:

But the modern critic not only permits a false practice; he absolutely prescribes false aims.—'A true allegory of the state of one's own mind in a representative history', the Poet is told, 'is perhaps the highest thing that one can attempt in the way of poetry'.—And accordingly he attempts it. An allegory of the state of one's own mind, the highest problem of an art which imitates actions? No, assuredly, it is not, it never can be so: no great poetical work has ever been produced with such an aim. Faust itself, in which something of the kind is attempted, wonderful passages as it contains, and in spite of the unsurpassed beauty of the scenes which relate to Margaret, Faust itself, judged as a whole, and strictly as a poetical work, is defective: its illustrious author, the greatest poet of modern times, the greatest critic of all times, would have been the first to acknowledge it; he only defended his work, indeed, by asserting it to be 'something incommensurable'.

The 'modern critic' here criticized we must suppose to be Ludlow. That he should be reviewing, sympathetically, the *Poetics* of Dallas

¹ *Letters*, i., p. 30.

suggests in itself that he is not particularly 'modern'. Nobody now reads Dallas—or only the Saintsburys and Eltons. 'We trace in Dallas everywhere', says Dr. Elton, 'the infection of Matthew Arnold's pronouncement that poetry and letters are, or should be, or may become, the most important things in the world'. Dallas, I feel, was not to that degree the poor dependent of Arnold. It is at least worth remembering that his first book, the *Poetics*, was published before Matthew Arnold had written any line of criticism; and that a part cause of the Preface of 1853 is Ludlow's review of Dallas.

Ludlow was less interested in Dallas than in developing his own philosophy of poetry. This he does, obscurely, and perhaps pretentiously, certainly at inordinate length; so that Matthew Arnold may be forgiven if he read him (as I fear he did) with lax attention and imperfect understanding. When he has finished with the *Poetics*, Ludlow essays to apply to the *Poems* of Alexander Smith the principles of criticism which he has inferred from his study of Dallas. 'Now, as we have already said,' he writes, 'a true allegory of the state of one's own mind in a representative history, whether narrative or dramatic in form, is perhaps the highest thing that one can attempt in the way of fictitious art . . . As such a history Mr. Smith's *Life Drama* has certain real merits'.

That is not to praise Mr. Smith very highly. But to praise him at all was to disturb Matthew Arnold. So much disturbed is he that he pays no attention to Ludlow's 'as we have already said'. Had he done so, he would have looked back to p. 318 of Ludlow's article; and would have thought twice before summoning portentously to Ludlow's refutation 'the greatest poet of modern times, the greatest critic of all times'. For alas! what Ludlow had 'already said', on p. 318, he had said, not on his own authority, but citing 'the greatest poet of modern times, the greatest critic of all times'. The heresy refuted out of Goethe is that of Goethe himself.

'Certain real merits' the poetry of Alexander Smith had, and has. These Ludlow liberally allows. But he gives to 'Mr. Smith' plenty of good advice. He gives him, in truth, much the kind of advice that Matthew Arnold would have given; emphasizing, in particular, the importance in poetry of action and subject. 'We think', he writes, 'that if, in any future poem, Mr. Smith were to make it his aim more thoroughly and coherently to imagine first of all the entire stem of incident and circumstance meant to constitute the poem, from beginning to end, and then to attend to the parts and filling up, he

would leave to many of his critics much less to be said against him'. Is not this, in truth, the very gospel of the Preface of 1853? Take, again, this: 'The importance attached to a sensuous richness of language as part of poetry is, Mr. Dallas thinks, too great at present; and he proposes that a power of appreciating such severe literary beauty as that of Sophocles shall, more than anything else, be reckoned to the credit of a man's poetical taste. We think Mr. Dallas, on the whole, is in the right'. The hand is that of Ludlow, or Mr. Dallas, but the voice is the voice of Matthew Arnold!

Not all, then, of Ludlow's article can be called 'cant'. What has put Matthew Arnold out of temper is, in truth, not Ludlow, but Alexander Smith. Of the impatience which Alexander Smith's poetry excited in Matthew Arnold I have said something elsewhere¹; and 'it was not jealousy', I have said; for 'like a good many men who have a just sense of their own merits, Matthew Arnold was jealous of nobody'. I believe that to be true. Yet I think it true also that, but for the *Poems* of Alexander Smith, we should never have had the Preface of 1853.

'Look at Alexander Smith's poems, which some people speak of', Arnold writes to Clough on 21 March, 1853, 'and let me know what you think of them'. On 14 April, he writes to his sister: 'There is an article by Forster on A. Smith—a most elaborate one—in last week's *Examiner*, which is worth reading. It can do me no good, meanwhile, to be irritated by that young man, who has certainly an extraordinary faculty, although I think he is a phenomenon of a very dubious character; but—*il fait son métier—faisons le nôtre*'. 'I am occupied', he adds, 'with a thing that gives me more pleasure than anything I have ever done yet'. The 'thing' which afforded him so much pleasure was *Sohrab and Rustum*. By 1 May, 1853, it was finished: 'I have just got through a thing', he writes to Clough, 'which pleases me better than anything I have yet done. . . . The material was a thoroughly good one, and what a thing is this! and how little do young writers feel what a thing it is—how it is *everything*'. The concluding clauses show the Preface already shaping, though it is not mentioned. Nor are we left in doubt who the 'young writers' are who fail to understand the importance, in poetry, of a good subject-matter. For the letter goes on: 'As to Alexander Smith I have not read him—I shrink from what is so intensely immature—and I think at the same time that he will not go far. I have not room or

¹ *Poetry and the Criticism of Life*, pp. 27–30.

time for my reasons—but I think so. This kind does not go far: it either dies like Keats or loses itself like Browning'. To the same date belongs an undated letter to his mother in which both *Sohrab and Rustum* and the projected Preface are mentioned: 'The story is a very noble and excellent one . . . I have arranged with Fellowes to publish this . . . with a Preface, and my name. . . . You ask about Alexander Smith. There are beautiful passages in him, but I think it doubtful how he will turn [out]'.¹ He had bidden Clough to 'look at Alexander's Smith's poems'. In Cambridge, Mass., Clough was doing so. Side by side with the *Poems* of Alexander Smith, he was studying the poems of 'A'—Arnold's two volumes of 1849 and 1852. He was not only studying them; he was preparing a review of them. 'I should like to read an article of yours on me', Arnold writes²: 'I should read it with a curious feeling'. The review appeared in the *North American Review* of July 1853; and if Arnold read it, as I think he must have done, with 'a curious feeling', he had himself well in control when he wrote to Clough about it. 'They think here', he writes,³ 'that your article on me is obscure and peu favorable—but I do not myself think either of these things'. Certainly the review was not obscure. It could leave neither Arnold nor anyone else in doubt that, of the two poets reviewed, Smith and 'A', Clough felt himself more nearly drawn to Smith. But 'it could do no good, meanwhile, to be irritated by that young man'. Arnold believed in himself, against the world—the power to do that remained with him to the end; and he just thought Clough wrong. His *Poems* of 1853 were already in the press. 'Froude says he can certainly review me in January', he tells Clough—the sentence follows immediately on the sentences about Clough's *North American* review; and, so placed, it must have carried, for Clough, some note of reproach, though Arnold, I feel, was hardly conscious of this. 'To Arnold,' says Arnold's latest biographer,⁴ Clough's review 'must have been significant and distressing, even insulting'. That I cannot accept; it does less than justice, I think, both to Arnold and to Clough. Nor can I quite accept it from Mr. Trilling that 'the Preface of October [1853] is, in effect, an answer to Clough's review of July'.⁵ The Preface had been in Arnold's mind since the beginning of May. So far as our

¹ *Letters*, i., p. 30.

² *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, p. 135.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁴ Lionel Trilling: *Matthew Arnold*, p. 146.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

information goes, Clough's review did not reach Arnold before the last week of August. It was then that Froude 'discounselled' from a preface; and Clough's review, I conjecture, may well have had something to do with the advice Froude gave—*it would never do* for Arnold to seem to be answering Clough or attacking Alexander Smith.

In the Preface, Arnold is attacking, in fact, not Alexander Smith, but the antecedents of Alexander Smith. These are well exposed in the opening paragraphs of Clough's review. 'The antecedents', Clough writes, 'of the *Life-Drama*, the one long poem which occupies almost the whole of his [Alexander Smith's] volume, are to be found in the 'Princess', in parts of Mrs. Browning, in the love of Keats, and the *habit* of Shakespeare . . . We have before us, we may say, the latest disciple of the school of Keats'. Arnold's Preface is, in truth, an answer, not to Clough's review, but to a book which had appeared five years earlier, the *Life, Letters and Literary Remains of John Keats*, edited by Monckton Milnes. 'What a brute you were to tell me to read Keats' Letters', Arnold writes¹ to Clough; 'What harm he has done in English Poetry! As Browning is a man with a moderate gift passionately desiring movement and fulness, and obtaining but a confused multitudinousness; so Keats, with a very high gift, is yet also consumed by this desire: and cannot produce the truly living and moving, as his conscience keeps telling him. . . . What perplexity Keats Tennyson et id genus omne must occasion to young writers . . . yes, and those d—d Elizabethan writers generally!'

Writing to Clough² on 28 October, 1852, he takes up the subject again, in a letter in which the 1853 Preface appears already in outline: 'Keats and Shelley were on a false track when they set themselves to reproduce the exuberance of expression, the charm, the richness of images, and the felicity, of the Elizabethan poets . . . The language, style and general proceedings of a poetry which has an immense task to perform, must be very plain, direct and severe: and it must not lose itself in parts and episodes and ornamental work, but must press forwards to the whole'. Hardly was this written when 'the latest disciple of the school of Keats' captured the literary world with his *Life Drama*; and 'this kind does not go far: it dies like Keats or loses itself like Browning', Arnold comments.

¹ *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, pp. 96-7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 124.

While the Preface was in his mind, Matthew Arnold was reading Haydon's Journals with 'the details about poor Keats at the end'. 'Haydon himself is a false butcher—revolting'.¹ But some time, we must suppose, in 1852 Arnold was putting the last touches to a poem which is more like a poem of Keats than anything which has appeared in our literature since Keats died—*The Scholar Gipsy*. Yet, out of love with Keats, he was out of love with his own masterpiece. 'I am glad you like the Gipsy Scholar', he writes to Clough; 'but what does he *do* for you? . . . The Gipsy Scholar at best awakens a pleasing melancholy. But this is not what we want'. If he did not convert Clough to this view of *The Scholar Gipsy*, he converted, I think, a friend whose sympathy meant more to him, at the moment, than that of Clough—he converted Froude. I say that because I think it certain that the review of the 1853 *Poems* printed in *Fraser's Magazine* of May 1854² is the work of Froude. The identification seems to follow from a comparison between the review and a letter of Froude to Clough first made known in Dr. Lowry's edition of Arnold's Letters to Clough.³ The letter calls attention to the frequency with which the word *tent* recurs in the opening paragraph of *Sohrab and Rustum*; and it can hardly be accident that exactly the same remark is made in the review.⁴ Froude is known to have written the review which appeared in the *Westminster Review* of January 1854. It is interesting accordingly to find the *Westminster* mentioned in *Fraser* as one of the only two journals that have done full justice to Matthew Arnold's poems (the other journal was *The Times*, in which Matthew Arnold had been reviewed by Goldwin Smith). But there were two things in the 1853 volume which could 'neither excite nor please' Froude (or Fraser); and one of them is *The Scholar Gipsy*, though good judges, it is allowed, have thought it 'the best thing in the book'.

In the *Fraser* review, Froude—if it be he—takes occasion to deprecate an earlier article in the same journal in which some of the poems of 'A' had been 'much blamed—perhaps somewhat too severely'. In May 1849 *Fraser* had printed⁵ an article entitled *Recent Poetry and Recent Verse*, reviewing, with other recent books of verse, *The Strayed Reveller* and the *Ambarvalia* of Clough and Burbidge. Who the reviewer was whose undue severity Froude deprecates I do

¹ *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, p. 139.

² XLIX., pp. 140-9.

³ P. 144.

⁴ P. 127, n. 3.

⁵ XXXIX., pp. 570-86.

not know. It would not surprise me to find that he was Kingsley. At least he belongs to the Maurice-Kingsley-Ludlow group—these Christian Socialists could never quite reconcile themselves to Matthew Arnold, nor ever quite forgive him for being insufficiently like his father—his defect of ‘severe manliness’ is noticed by Ludlow (if Ludlow be the *North British* reviewer of *The Strayed Reveller*). Certainly, when he wrote his Preface, Matthew Arnold had in mind some parts of this earlier *Fraser* review. ‘Both poets and poetasters’, the reviewer wrote, ‘seem utterly at a loss what they shall sing. *One would have thought that there was no dearth of subjects in the present*’. That is said generally. But more specifically, ‘What does the age want’, says the reviewer, ‘with fragments of an *Antigone*?’ If Matthew Arnold did not much like being told by this critic that *Resignation* (one of his own favourite poems, and the favourite of many of his admirers) was just ‘a yawn thirteen pages long’, he disliked still more, I fancy, being told that his *Mycerinus* was ‘a fragment worthy of Tennyson’, and that his *Forsaken Merman* had the merit of recalling Tennyson’s *Merman* and *Mermaid*. The reviewer mentions a report that ‘Mr. Tennyson intends at last to give the world one great poem worthy of himself’. Mr. Tennyson obliged with *In Memoriam* in the year following. He had done what he could two years previously; and if his *Princess* (1847) had not satisfied *Fraser*, it had influenced the *Poems* of that ‘dubious character’ Alexander Smith.

For Froude, the Froude of *Fraser*, *The Scholar Gipsy* ‘did nothing’. For him, as for its author, it was too Keats-like either to ‘please’ or to ‘excite’. For the ‘modern’, for the romantic, Froude, it may be suspected, had at this time even less liking than Arnold. *Sohrab and Rustum* is ‘perfectly good’. But even this perfect piece has its blemish. Its last paragraph—the ‘majestic Oxus’ passage—would be better away. It wears a beauty not purely classical. There is no critical opinion so monstrous, we may suppose, but that someone will be found to voice it. This particular opinion had the fortune to be voiced, not by Froude alone, but by a writer in *Blackwood’s Magazine*, March 1854, p. 312. The *North British Review*¹ showed, here, better sense: ‘Such a close is not Homeric, not Greek, but modern, and none the worse for that’. But nothing less than the Homeric manner will satisfy Froude. Incidentally, he urges upon Arnold that he should undertake a translation of Homer. ‘It has more than once been suggested to me that I should translate Homer’, Arnold wrote in

¹ XXI., August 1854, p. 496.

1861.¹ At all times he valued, I think, any suggestion coming from Froude.

Consistently with his liking for the Homeric manner, Froude does not like *Tristram and Iseult*. To that poem he objects, with justice, that it brings its poet into conflict with just those canons of poetry which his 'sensible Preface' laboured to establish. *Tristram and Iseult* is, in truth, sicklied over with the pale cast of romanticism. I will not say that Alexander Smith could have written it; but he could have written something like it. For Alexander Smith Froude has even less use than Arnold; and that Arnold's Poems, if not the Preface to them, are a bold and effective challenge to the whole of the 'Spasmodic School', he seems plainly aware. 'Farewell, Baileys and Smiths', he exclaims, 'ay, and even greater names, till you change to something more like this!' In the reference to 'even greater names' we may suppose him to glance off to Tennyson.

'Farewell, Baileys and Smiths!' And if anyone asks, *Whither shall a man turn?* Froude has his answer; and keeps it for the *Westminster Review*.² There, having pondered what Arnold says about the importance to the poet of a good subject, he lays it down that 'Whatever will excite interest in a healthy vigorous mind is a fair object of poetry'. Upon *Empedocles*, and the withdrawal of it from the volume of 1853, he remarks very truly that the reasons which Arnold gives for withdrawing it are bad ones. There was nothing the matter, he says, with the subject. What was the matter was that the poem was not a good one. The truth is, I believe, that the first Part of the poem is dreary and ineffective; the second Part our literature could ill spare. Upon the choice of a *subject* in poetry, Froude throws out a suggestion, harmless perhaps in itself, but fraught, I must think, with fatal harm to the genius of Matthew Arnold. 'It seems,' he writes, 'as if the Teutonic tradition, Teutonic feeling, and Teutonic thought had the first claim on English and German poets'. I cannot suppose that it was only in the *Westminster Review* that Froude pressed this opinion on Arnold. He was in close touch with Arnold while the *Poems* of 1853 were being made ready for the press. His influence was powerfully exerted at a time when, from whatever cause, the influence of Clough was sensibly weakened. That he did not preach Teutonism in vain, *Balder Dead* is our witness. If it had not been *Balder*, it would have been Brunhild. In 1876, Arnold speaks of 'the Nibelungen ring, and Fafnir and Siegfried and Gudrun and Brun-

¹ *On Translating Homer*, I, *imit.*

² V., January 1854, pp. 146-59.

hilde, *all of whom I had once hoped to touch in poetry*'.¹ The hopes of which he here speaks must, I think, be those of the period immediately following the publication of the 1853 *Poems*. *Balder Dead* was begun at the end of 1853. Finished in October 1854, it was placed first in the *Poems, Second Series* of 1855. There is a certain comicality in the chance which caused it to follow at a few months' interval the *Balder* of Sydney Dobell. Dobell's *Balder* has nothing to do with the *Balder* of Scandinavian legend. He is 'modern', and with just those faults of the 'modern' which the Preface of 1853 is set to kill. I do not know that Arnold anywhere refers to Dobell. Alexander Smith he knows; Bailey he knows—placing him (in 1848)² among 'the promising verse-writers'. But of the third, and—as some think—the greatest, of the Spasmodists, I find no mention.

Matthew Arnold's imagination was haunted by the idea of the Great Poem. In the Preface to the *Poems* of 1853, he takes up the critical quest of it. He had written *Sohrab and Rustum*—at least a shadow of the Great Poem. He had written *The Scholar Gipsy*; a composition Keats-like in its mere perfection of loveliness. But, whatever the Great Poem was, it was not like Keats. So much Alexander Smith had taught him. When he had put the last touches, accordingly, to his Preface, he sat down and wrote *Balder Dead*. It was not acclaimed; his own heart did not acclaim it. There were more people, it may be suspected, who read with pleasure the *Balder* of Dobell. In 1857 the apostle of the Great Poem became professor of poetry in the University of Oxford. He owed his election, I have said, to the *Poems* of 1853—and the Preface to them. But, even in Oxford, there was no great enthusiasm for *Balder Dead*. Yet neither was there any great enthusiasm for 'the modern element in literature'—just because there was not, Arnold was made professor. 'The Modern Element in Literature' was the subject of his first professorial lecture. The lecture is a performance much inferior to the Preface. The Preface had been clear, lively, novel. The lecture was confused, dull, and in parts trite. Whether it was thought so at the time I cannot say. The only report of it that I know comes from a grandson of the poet Wordsworth. 'As a composition', he writes,³ 'it was pointed and telling: tho' the matter was little to my taste'. What was 'little to the taste' of the young Wordsworth was to be told that only

¹ *Letters*, ii, p. 134.

² *Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough*, p. 66.

³ *Correspondence of Crabb Robinson*, p. 825.

the ancients are modern, and that we must go back in our poetry to Sophocles. Back to Sophocles Matthew Arnold was willing to go—and went. Within a year of delivering his lecture, he published *Merope*.

In 1865, he published *Thyrsis*. What Clough could not do, the memory of Clough had done: it had called Matthew Arnold back to Keats. In 1853 he had just finished *The Scholar Gipsy*; and 'What does it *do* for you?' he asks Clough. Forthwith, he must needs write the Preface; in which he repudiates, in effect, the influences which had gone to make his best poem. He repudiates these; and he announces a new order. Within that new order lie *Balder Dead* and *Merope*. Neither is *Balder Dead* the Great Poem, nor is *Merope* the Great Poem. Only for those isolated beauties which Arnold despised in poetry can either composition be esteemed a poem at all. After the Preface, not only is there no Great Poem, there is in truth no poetry, or so little as hardly to matter—until *Thyrsis*. With *Thyrsis* we are back where we began; back to *The Scholar Gipsy*, and the foresworn world of Keats. Between *The Scholar Gipsy* and *Thyrsis* lie the Preface and the desert.

The Christian Remembrancer is a journal remembered today, I should suppose, by very few persons. Matthew Arnold jests¹ at the 'limited circulation' which it enjoyed in 1854, when it printed a laboured review² of his *Poems* from the pen of his friend John Duke Coleridge. He rallies Coleridge on 'the unquestionable viciousness of his article.' Coleridge had little good to say of the Preface: a preface in which the author 'favours us with a theory of poetry which we take leave to think entirely fallacious and inadequate'. He concludes: 'It is simply idle to say that poetry is this or that, when it really pervades the universe'. Matthew Arnold's Preface, we may at least agree, too much shepherds poetry into a corner, and allows too little for the strong instinct which it has for odd times and places.

¹ *Letters*, i, p. 35.

² XVII., pp. 310-33.

THE TEXT OF TROLLOPE'S NOVELS

BY R. W. CHAPMAN

My interest in this subject began a few years ago. But it was a prolonged convalescence in 1940 that gave me leisure to cultivate my hobby extensively and intensively, at the same time that it combined with external circumstances to excuse me from following the customary rules. Thus, with slight though not unimportant exceptions, I have been unable to inspect Trollope's extant manuscripts. I have not found it convenient—again with slight exceptions—even to verify that the *World's Classics* texts (to which I refer throughout) are faithful to the first editions or to any editions which Trollope (for all I know) may have supervised.¹ These irregularities do not, I believe, seriously impair the value of my speculations.

I have argued the question, in general and in particular, in several articles:

(1) *Review of English Studies* XVII. 65, January 1941, p. 90. Here I report certain doubts and emendations in the posthumous *Autobiography*, most of which were confirmed by reference to the manuscript in the British Museum. This I have not seen *meis oculis*; indeed the only scrap of Trollope's writing I have seen is one short letter formerly in my possession.

(2) *Review of English Studies* April 1941, p. 184. Here I give a much larger number of conjectures in *Phineas Redux*.

(3) An unpublished article on *Ayala's Angel*. (Forthcoming, I believe, in *P.M.L.A.*)

(4) *Times Literary Supplement* 25 January 1941. Emendations in the posthumous *An Old Man's Love*.

(5) *Times Literary Supplement* 22 March 1941. Emendations in *Ralph the Heir*.

I now come to the main theme of the present article, which is in two parts.

¹ Professor Paul Maas checked my conjectures in *Ayala's Angel* with the first edition. Three of them were confirmed. In all the other places the first edition had the same reading as the *World's Classics*. Mr. Simon Nowell Smith has very kindly done the same for *Phineas Redux* and reports that all the passages in question are identical in the first collected edition and in the *World's Classics*.

I. STATISTICS

Since I began this inquiry I have read or reread, with certain omissions (e.g. the 'Bayswater Romance' in *The Last Chronicle of Barset*, lest it bore me), the Barsetshire series, the Palliser series,¹ and a number of the other novels. As I read I noted my doubts of the text, and where I doubted I usually attempted a correction. These doubts and corrections I have either published, or hope to publish, in some detail. But I here present an interim report, which is in part statistical. These statistics are not free from the element called personal. My results are given chronologically in the order of Trollope's publication; but that was not the order of my reading. I am aware that as I went on I became increasingly vigilant—though with lapses into pardonable boredom or unaccountable negligence—and that as my knowledge grew I became increasingly competent and therefore increasingly suspicious—critics may think, inordinately so. If I did my work over again the figures would doubtless be modified.² I am however satisfied that they are not gravely misleading, and that they confer on my researches the merit of objectivity. The figures show, on the whole, a progressive deterioration from the novels of Trollope's early prime, in which I find hardly anything amiss, to those of his late middle age, in which I find a good deal. They show moreover a sharp rise in the curve just when his physical decline became manifest, and a further rise in one book of which he did not live to read the proofs.

To this uniformity there is one conspicuous exception. *Phineas Redux* was written when Trollope was at the height of his powers. Yet I find it more corrupt than any book of which he read the proofs. But for this I have suggested reasons arising out of the circumstances of publication.

In the list that follows I give the novels which I have read for this purpose in the order of their publication, with the approximate number of places in which I think the text may be reasonably suspected. The numbers of corrupt places, if they are to be relatively significant, must be reckoned together with the length of the books in which they occur. I give, therefore, where necessary, the approximate number of words. A further consideration is the nature of the

¹ I should note, since it affects the statistics, that I skipped the low comedy in *Can You Forgive Her?* (as intolerably jocose), and most of the Lopez business in *The Prime Minister* (as intolerably gloomy).

² By way of check I have once more read *The Warden*, which I had formerly drawn blank, and find a maximum of 6 doubtful places.

proofs and the circumstances of their verification. At one end of this scale is, e.g. *Doctor Wortle's School*, a book of some 80,000 words which was first published in book form. I do not know the quality of the proofs, as to paper and inking; but the first edition as finally printed is very legible. At the other end of the scale is, e.g. *Phineas Redux*, a book of some 286,000 words, first published in the weekly *Graphic*; of which it may be confidently assumed that the proofs were by no means legible. Probably, moreover, they came in weekly batches and had to be returned within a few hours; it is quite possible that some instalments were not read by the author at all. But these factors I have not been able to investigate except in a very cursory way.

Loci Suspecti (approx.)

1855	The Warden	W. (66,000)	6
1857	Barchester Towers	B.T.	0
1858	Doctor Thorne	D.T.	1
1861	Framley Parsonage	F.P.	2
1862	Orley Farm	O.F. (358,000)	3
1862	The Small House at Allington	S.H.A.	1
1864	Can You Forgive Her?	C.Y.F.H.	9
1865	Miss Mackenzie	M.M.	13
1867	The Claverings	C.	3
1867	The Last Chronicle of Barset	L.C.B.	0
1869	Phineas Finn	Ph.F.	7
1870	The Vicar of Bullhampton	V.B.	10
1871	Sir Harry Hotspur	H.H.	10
1871	Ralph the Heir	R.H. (195,000)	26
1873	The Eustace Diamonds	E.D. (266,000)	11
1873-4	Phineas Redux	Ph.R. (286,000)	67
1874	Lady Anna	L.A.	4
1874-5	The Way We Live Now	W.W.L.N.	3
1876	The Prime Minister	P.M.	1
1877	The American Senator	A.S. (222,000)	35
1879	Cousin Henry	C.H. (69,000)	1
1880	The Duke's Children	D.C. (222,000)	10
1881	Ayala's Angel	A.A. (244,000)	32
1881	Doctor Wortle's School	D.W.S. (80,000)	4
(A.T. died 6 December 1882)			
[1883	Autobiography]		
1884	An Old Man's Love	O.M.L. (82,000)	20

II. AN ATTEMPT AT CLASSIFICATION

Classical palaeographers are able to analyse the causes of corruption down to the lowest unit, i.e. the single letter. Thus it is a commonplace of Greek textual criticism that in uncial writing Γ and Τ, Δ and Λ, were confused, so that ΜΕΤΑΔΩΣΟΥΣΙΩΝ, that is μεταδώσουσι ὦν, was read as ΜΕΓΑΔΩΣΟΥΣΙΩΝ, that is μεγάλως οὐσιῶν; and that in minuscule writing β and κ were confused, so that βλάβας was read as κλάβας. In modern writing, with its ligatures, no such precision is attainable. Yet in dealing with an accurate modern hand something like it is attainable. I say nothing of the application, in our time, of critical method to the texts of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, who are hardly modern in my sense, and were not all accurate. It is safer to rely on my own experience however limited. For many years I have been comparing the printed texts, from 1788 to 1892, of Samuel Johnson's letters with the originals which I have from time to time been able to consult. I have ascertained that a printer or an editor might, and in fact did, mistake Johnson's initial *e* for *s*, and read *safely* where he wrote *easily*; his initial *t* for *f*, and read *she* for *the*, *story* for *thing*; his *gr* for *qu*, and read *qualification* for *gratification*, *consequent* for *cause great*—and more to the same purpose.

My direct knowledge of Trollope's handwriting in general, and of his literary manuscripts in particular, I have confessed to be very slender. My indirect knowledge, which is rather opinion, rests on a wider yet a far more precarious basis. All I could do was to guess. Yet as I went on I found that guess corroborated guess, until at last a nebula of conjecture hardened into a palpable mass of probability surrounding a nucleus of certainty. Of the probability others must judge. The nucleus of certainty is made up of two elements. (1) Some dozen or more guesses in the posthumous *Autobiography*¹ were confirmed by reference to the manuscript: a total absolutely small but relatively large, for I suspected very few places which proved to be sound, and nearly all my shots found the target. (Once or twice I did not fire, having to content myself with spotting a corruption which I could not cure.) (2) In the novels a few—very few—of my guesses were confirmed by my author. Thus in *Phineas*

¹ Note that the conjectures in the posthumous *An Old Man's Love*, though not verified, are *a priori* more likely to be called for than those in the other novels, since Trollope did not read the proofs.

Redux II 181 I saw that *Greek* must be *Czech*; for why take an interpreter who spoke *Greek and German* to Prague? Confirmation came at 282, where the printer got it right. In *The Duke's Children* I 358 I guessed that *Ledburgh* should be *Sedbergh*. This was not so easy, but it was not very difficult. Trollope knew England as few men have ever known it; and it was often his practice to base his topographical fictions on topographical fact, to relate imaginary houses and villages to real towns. I was, however, gratified when I found *Sedbergh* at II 377. In *Ralph the Heir* II 31 the Squire's son's friend *George Morris* is once called *George Harris*. There can be no question of his identity; and as he is several times called *Morris* in the same chapter there can be no question of Trollope's having forgotten. In the same book, more surprisingly, *Sir Thomas Underwood*, one of the principal characters, is twice or thrice addressed as *Honeywood*. This may with almost, though not quite, equal certainty be regarded as a printer's error, most strangely overlooked by the author.¹

Such is my material. Its nature enables me to say with some confidence—though thousands of pages of Trollope's manuscript survive to convict me if I err—that for his case it is not possible to elaborate any precise critical technique. The handwriting is too bad to admit that. Not only are ascenders (as *b*, *h*, *l*) confused with ascenders, descenders (as *g*, *q*) with descenders, and vertically short letters (as *a*, *n*, *m*) with vertically short letters. Members of any one of these classes are confused with members of the others. Almost anything may happen; and I was at one time tempted to think only one criterion valid: that when the printer misread a word he normally substituted a word of approximately the same length.

But it is not so bad as that. When I came to sort my accumulated fragments, I saw that they did after all form a kind of pattern. I now present a selection of these, tending to show that canons of Trollopian criticism can be framed on the traditional lines, though the demarcation is inevitably sketchy. The pieces are chosen both with regard to their intrinsic probability (for a conjecture may be worse than useless if it is wrong), and with regard also to their illustrative value as exemplifying rules which were established long ago in a clearer atmosphere and are still, if faintly, discernible through the Victorian fog.

¹ This confusion was not reproduced in the *World's Classics* reprint, and I am not able to give the references. For a discussion of the error see my *T.L.S.* article.

SUMMARY OF CLASSIFIED ERRORS

1. Confusion

- (a) Vertical shorts confused
- (b) Ascenders and descenders confused

2. Omission

- (a) Final s omitted.
- (b) Haplography
- (c) Homoeoteleuton
- (d) Negative omitted

3. Doublets

4. Transposition

5. Assimilation

1 (a) Confusion of letters or groups of letters involving only vertically short letters. The commonest error in this class is *then* < *there*, *when* < *where*. F.P. 11 line 12 from foot (f.f. hereafter), V.B. 263 l. 10, 459 l. 23, 460 l. 9, C.Y.F.H. II. 465 l. 4, Ph.R. II 214 l. 5 f.f., 373 l. 7 f.f., A.S. 159 l. 15, 536 l. 6 f.f., A.A. 19 l. 14 f.f., 36 last line and 37 l. 2, 385 l. 6, O.M.L. 249 last line and 250 ll. 1 and 3.

Examples from the *Autobiography* (which therefore are not conjectural) are: 122 l. 10 *into* < *out*, 126 l. 6 f.f. *on* < *over*, 174 l. 4 f.f. *assured* < *assumed*, 187 l. 18 *mainly* < *namely*, 213 last line *proposition* < *proportion*, 242 l. 12 f.f. *perpetuated* < *perpetrated*, 251 l. 11 f.f. *victory* < *rectory*, 258 middle *promise* < *procure*. At 169 l. 8 I conjecture *even* for *ever*, at 258 l. 2 *ever* for *even*. Mr. Frederick Page, who examined the MS., tells me that he cannot decide which Trollope wrote. (Readers of Boswell's *Hebrides* will remember that Johnson called on him to correct 'The Devil answers even in engines', and Boswell got it right: 'ever in enigmas'). So also A.S. 161 l. 7, 401 l. 14 f.f., E.D. 211 last line.

Other examples: V.B. 89 l. 7 *was* < *once*, 132 l. 21 *even* gave < *can give*, O.F. I 109 l. 5 f.f. *on* < *or*.

S.H.A. I 417 l. 5 *continued* < *contrived*; C.Y.F.H. I 484 l. 10 f.f. *amount* < *account* (and so C. 237 l. 3 f.f.), II 45 l. 2 *love* for *lore*.

Ph.F. I 403 middle *division* < *decision*, II 419 l. 14 *plan* < *place*. H.H. 7 last line *or* < *as* (cf. V.B. 421 l. 3 f.f. *as* < *or* A.S. 177 l. 20 *or* < *as*, A.A. 375 l. 14 *as* < *or*), 42 l. 13 *sin* < *sex*, 64 l. 9 f.f. *prepare* < *propose*, 68 l. 20 *his* < *her* (and so E.D. 533 l. 7 f.f., Ph.R. II 296 last line, A.S. 367 l. 11 f.f. cf. A.A. 62 l. 16 *her* < *his*).

R.H. I. 74 l. 15 *admonitory* < *a dormitory*, I 185 l. 10 f.f. *expressive*

<expression, II 182 l. 7 f.f. *these*<*their*. E.D. 591 l. 4 f.f. *Then*<*Thus*.

Ph.R. I 9 l. 5 f.f. *am*<*was*, I 87 l. 2 *discussing*<*discerning*, I 93 l. 7 *some*<*more*, I 136 l. 10 f.f. *cemented*<*concerted*, I 225 l. 6 f.f. *home*<*here*, I 284 l. 5 *use*<*issue*, I 367 l. 7 f.f. *person*<*parson*, II 29 l. 10 *now*<*once*, II 211 *middle matter*<*motto*, II 278 l. 16 *ventured*<*contrived*.

E.D. 141 l. 2 f.f. *on*<*over* (cf. *Autobiography* 126), 247 l. 13 f.f. *few*<*far*, 272 l. 17 *charms*<*chances*.

L.A. 13 l. 12 f.f. *new*<*now*, 105 l. 18 *so*<*no*, 140 l. 13 f.f. *at*<*out*.

A.S. 161 l. 7 *waiting*<*wanting*, 297 l. 17 f.f. *mutual*<*material*, 458 l. 13 *turns*<*times*, 504 l. 19 *anxious*<*conscious*.

D.C. I 222 l. 4 f.f. *assist*<*assent*, I 245 l. 11 *act*<*art*.

A.A. 78 l. 14 f.f. *attractive*<*attentive*, 238 l. 12 f.f. *are*<*owe*, 249 l. 13 f.f. *even*<*men*, 420 l. 16 *was*<*were*, (cf. R.H. II 41 l. 11 *were*<*was*), 417 l. 5 f.f. *drawing-room*<*dining-room* (cf. A.S. 247 l. 19), 498 *middle running*<*remaining*, 501 l. 10 f.f. *over*<*once*.

D.W.S. 126 l. 11 *men*<*more*, (cf. R.H. II 88 l. 9 *mere*<*more*), last line *main spirit*<*man's part*.

O.M.L. 3 l. 10 *could*<*would* (cf. R.H. II 23, l. 12 f.f. *would*<*could*), 54 l. 5 *loving him*<*living here*.

1 (b) Involving ascenders and/or descenders, as well as (in most cases) vertically short letters.

Examples from the *Autobiography*: 60 l. 10 f.f. *remember*<*encounter*, 163 l. 9 f.f. *French*<*female*, 177 *middle needful*<*useful*, 189 l. 4 *work*<*walk*, 251, l. 11 f.f. *in*<*at*, 272 *middle defeating*<*dissenting*.

Other examples: F.P. 497 l. 8 f.f. *daily*<*dairy*; V.B. 1 l. 8 *Haylesbury*<*Heytesbury* (maybe Trollope's mistake; the name does not recur till 80, after which it is frequent), 345 l. 9 *endorsed*<*enclosed*; O.F. II 107 l. 8 f.f. *worked*<*wormed* (cf. E.D. 51 l. 19 f.f. *women-mind*<*women-kind*). C.Y.F.H. II 194 l. 12 f.f. *untenanted*<*untended*, II 202, l. 13 f.f. *get*<*yet*, II, 230 l. 2 *quietness*<*quickness*, II 461 *middle Charles*<*Cosmo*, II 492 l. 4 *Sophy*<*Iphy*.

M.M. 181 l. 3 f.f. *elder*<*other*, 204 l. 15 *Monday*<*Tuesday*.

Ph.F. I 202 l. 15 f.f. *much*<*do not*, I 252 l. 14 f.f. *mistress*<*distress*.

H.H. 64 last line *house*<*grouse*, 72 l. 8 *entertainment*<*encouragement*.

R.H. I 228 l. 4 *was*<*has*, I 265 l. 12 *throbs*<*throes*, I 310 l. 7 *would*<*should* (cf. II 187 l. 11 *should*<*would*), II 31 l. 10 f.f. *Harris*<*Morris* (this, which is certain, encourages me to conjecture *Moreover* for

However at II 225 l. 6), II 84 l. 11 *really*<*doubly*, II 185 l. 2 *last*<*just*, II 207 l. 9 f.f. *graceful*<*grateful*, II 274 l. 4 f.f. *Mr.*<*the*.

E.D. 441 l. 19 f.f. *lightly*<*tightly*, 459 l. 21 *greatly*<*generally*.

Ph.R. I 41 l. 10 *pressing*<*precious*, I 55 l. 15 *fell*<*felt*, I 62 l. 14 f.f. *thing*<*sight* (cf. I 146 l. 7 *things*<*beings*, I 149 l. 8 *think*<*sigh*—a very doubtful correction; I 286 middle *things* is I think suspicious), I 68 l. 6 f.f. *parties*<*politics*, I 156 l. 7 *worse*<*lesser*, I 157 l. 1 *almost*<*at least*, I 166 l. 7 f.f. *actually*<*annually*, I 305 l. 7 *having*<*leaving* (cf. A.A. 436 l. 9 *have*<*love*), I 341 l. 12 *position*<*fortune*, I 408 l. 11 *two*<*five*, I 429 l. 9 f.f. *form*<*join*, II 174 l. 6 f.f. *kept*<*left*, II 181 l. 8 *Greek*<*Czech*, II 189 l. 12 f.f. *warmly*<*worthy*, II 368 l. 8 *her*<*the*.

A.S. 72 l. 6 *of*<*at*, 88 l. 15 f.f. *par*<*year*, 155 l. 3 *expression*<*suggestion* (cf. 325 l. 13 *expect*<*suspect*—both of these are very doubtful), 214 l. 1 *need*<*time*, 377 l. 5 f.f. *treachery*<*teaching*, 391 last line *Sir*<*Old*, 439 l. 6 *object*<*project*, 454 l. 13 f.f. *property*<*poverty*, 480 l. 9 *induced*<*inclined*, 498 middle *I*<*he*, 499 l. 15 *can't*<*don't*, 501 l. 4 *mind*<*head*.

D.C. I 123 middle *occurs*<*appears*, I 326 l. 8 *speak*<*spread*, I 358 l. 13 *Ledburgh*<*Sedbergh*, II 249, l. 5 *inveterably*<*inveterately*.

A.A. 51 l. 14 f.f. *our*<*out* (confirmed by the first edition), 246 l. 2 *put*<*set*, 289 l. 9 *bracelet*<*trinket*, 363 l. 16 f.f. *namby-mamby*<*namby-pamby*, 389 l. 15 *have*<*become*, 436, l. 17 *dreamed*<*realised* (Prof. Maas, assuming *lis*=*m*), 470 l. 6 *mother*<*lover* (cf. M.M. 25 l. 14 f.f. *mother*<*brother*), 488 l. 8 *diet*<*dish*, 612 middle *unnatural*<*illnated*; D.W.S. 208 l. 11 f.f. *different*<*difficult*.

O.M.L. 15 l. 3 f.f. *probably*<*perfectly*, 72 l. 3 *heart*<*least*.

2 (a) Omission of final s. W. 169 l. 7 *council*<*councils*; O.F. I 82 l. 6 f.f. *Mr.*<*Mrs.*

R.H. II 123 l. 12 f.f. *hand*<*hands*, 253 l. 9 *letter*<*letters*, 278 l. 3 *task*<*tasks*.

Ph.R. II 64 l. 3 f.f. *word*<*words*, II 246 l. 8 *club*<*clubs*, II 311 l. 13 *quarrel*<*quarrels*.

A.S. 391 l. 7 *accusation*<*accusations*.

A.A. 595 l. 11 *sister*<*sisters*.

D.W.S. 261 middle *usher*<*ushers*.

2 (b) Omission by haplography, when of two consecutive groups of identical or similar letters one is dropped.

W. 179 l. 7 f.f. <*If*> *I have*.

H.H. 80 l. 7 *he in*<*him in* (I assume *him in* to be read as=*he in in*, since *in* and *m* are each of three 'minims').

Ph.R. I 166 l. 1 <*other*>*on the*, II 183 l. 15 f.f. <*other*>*of the*, II 206 *therefore*<*long*>*enjoyed* (here I equate *ong* with *enj*, assuming the printer's eye to have missed also the *l* of *long*, which might be very like the final *e* of *therefore*), II 415 l. 2 f.f. <*more*>*wine*.

A.A. 26 l. 5 f.f. *it*<*at*>*all*, 491 l. 11 f.f. *walk*<*back*>. Contrast A.S. 374 l. 11 f.f. *not knowing* [*now*] *how*, where the otiose *now* may be due to dittography.

2 (c) Omission by homoeoteleuton, when the eye jumps from the last word of a group to the, identical or similar, last word of the next group, so that the second group is skipped. This type of error is very common in manuscript transmission. It is also very often committed by compositors; but since print is checked, word for word, with the manuscript before it leaves the printing-office, the error does not very often reach the author or his public. Yet it may sometimes get through; if it does, it is from its nature hard to detect and harder to rectify.¹ I find in Trollope one example of which I am fairly confident.

Ph.R. II 315 l. 13 *a young man*<*and a young woman*>.

2 (d) Omission of *not*.

R.H. I 68 l. 10, 324 l. 8.

Ph.R. I 288 middle <*not*>*only*, II 208 l. 10, II 366 l. 3.

Contrast places where *not* seems to be intrusive: M.M. 374 l. 7 f.f., Ph.F. I 400 l. 3, L.A. 310 l. 5.

3. Doubtlets, due to the author's changing his mind *currente calamo* without adequate erasure of the rejected word.

M.M. 320 l. 11 f.f. *all class newspapers of the kind*.

H.H. 71 l. 5 f.f. *one of a number of numerous visitors*.

Ph.R. I 86 l. 8 *the gist of the expression expressed*, II 175 middle *enough ample evidence*.

4. Transposition, which in Trollope seems to be surprisingly rare. A.A. 214 l. 5 *with it*<*it with* (this proves to be a printer's error of 1929).

R.H. II 107 l. 7 f.f. *then why*<*why then* (but this is very doubtful).

5. Assimilation, when the right word is replaced by anticipation or repetition of a word in the context. This, like other types of error not purely graphical in origin, may as easily be committed by the author as by a copyist or printer.

¹ I may refer to my remarks in *Essays and Studies* XII, 1926, p. 58.

R.H. II 96 l. 10 *difficulty in escaping from the difficulty*. The second *difficulty* may be wrong. II 182 last line *injured* may be due to *injury* three lines above.

A.S. 283 l. 17 f.f. *they . . . they* < *he . . . they*.

O.M.L. 85 *the thing on which he had set his mind*. It all passed through her mind. The first *mind* should perhaps be *heart*. 138 l. 5 f.f. *Blake* is perhaps extruded in favour of *Gordon* which follows seven words later. 199 l. 9 *young mother* < *own mother*, by the influence of *young children* just above.

There are other sources of the corruption that is psychological, not graphical. But examples of such corruption do not seem to be numerous in Trollope, and I do not think we need often, if ever, suspect very deep-seated corruption. We have indeed to reckon with a number of fallibilities. First our author writing at his desk. He was incomparably diligent, but he was often careless or forgetful, as well as illegible. Then the compositor and the 'printer's reader', with the manuscript before them, would sometimes misread it and sometimes, perhaps, improve on it. Then the author, with the manuscript before him¹—but seldom looking at it?—would read his proofs, good or bad, at his leisure or in haste, carefully or carelessly, and when he detected error would not always, perhaps, correct it according to his original intention or with due regard to the context. Finally the press-reader, and in some cases the editor or sub-editor of a periodical, might take on himself to settle doubtful places. This seems a formidable chain of fallible agents, and is, perhaps, even so incomplete. But how short and simple it is if we compare it with that concatenation of contingency which links us to Sophocles or to Shakespeare.

¹ In the case of publication in a periodical, it is possible that the manuscript was not returned to the author. That is the practice of *The Times* today.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

'WINDOWS' IN SHAKESPEARE

The facts which explain Shakespeare's use of the window-eyelid image have generally been overlooked by his editors and even by the *O.E.D.* They are not, however, inaccessible, being contained in two notes in *Notes and Queries*, 1876, and in a note by the late W. J. Lawrence first published in *The Irish Statesman*, and included in his volume of essays, *Shakespeare's Workshop* (1928). In neither is the full evidence set out, and it is therefore presented here.

It is necessary first to make it clear that *window* is used, in five places in Shakespeare, as an image for eyelid, and secondly to show why this image should be a possible and even obvious one to an Elizabethan writer. The following are the instances in Shakespeare (references to Oxford text):—

- (1) Her two blue windows faintly she up-heaveth
(*Venus and Adonis*, 482).
- (2) thy eyes' windows fall Like death
(*Romeo and Juliet*, IV. 1. 100).
- (3) Ere I let fall the windows of mine eyes
(*Richard III*, V. 3. 117).
- (4) Downy windows, close
(*Antony and Cleopatra*, V. 2. 318).
- (5) the enclosed lights, now canopied
Under these windows, white and azure lac't . . .
(*Cymbeline*, II. 2. 22).

When the passages are seen together, no doubt should remain. These windows belong to but are not eyes; they shut out light; they are blue when the eyes themselves are grey. Venus (see l. 140) has, of course, the conventionally grey eyes of the medieval romance heroine, and the blue colour is, as with Imogen, that of the veins. The meaning 'eyelid' was not doubted by Schmidt (in whose *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, 1902, all five passages are cited), by Onions (*Shakespeare Glossary*, 1919, in which the first four are cited), or indeed by *O.E.D.*, though here only (1) and (3) are cited; but in none of these is there a hint of any reason for the image.

The commentators with one exception are still less helpful. In the Arden editions, (2) and (3) have no notes at all and the others

only scanty ones; in the Variorum, (3) alone has a really adequate note. Take, for example, (1): C. K. Pooler (Arden edition) still considers 'eyes' as a possible meaning: H. E. Rollins (the most recent volume in the Variorum edition—1938) gives an inconclusive summary of earlier opinions and has no cross-reference to the grey eyes of l. 140; in his note to that line he seems to accept the idea that there is not necessarily an inconsistency since blue and grey could signify the same colour. Rollins does, however, give the pertinacious reader a partial clue to the truth, by adding a bare reference to B. Nicholson's note in *Notes and Queries*, 1876, pp. 462f.

The Variorum note on (3) (H. H. Furness, jr., 1908) is, however, sensible and illuminating, and here alone among editorial notes are quoted two other important and relevant lines in which *window* seems to be used literally to mean something solid:

- (6) Shuts up his windows, locks fair daylight out
(*Romeo and Juliet*, I. 1. 144).
- (7) Pluck down forms, windows, anything
(*Julius Caesar*, III. 2. 264).¹

This editor alone thinks it necessary to suggest some reason why a word usually connoting transparency should be used to suggest opaqueness.

This is precisely the deficiency of the *O.E.D.* on this point. The following is the only relevant information given under *window*:—

- 4. *fig.* Applied to the senses or organs of sense, esp. the eyes, regarded as inlets or outlets to or from the mind or soul (also *transf.* in Shaks., applied to the eyelids).

The transference from an inlet or outlet to that which blocks the inlet or outlet seems an odd one.

The other annotated editions of Shakespeare that I have consulted are still more reticent. The ordinary reader seems to have only two sources of helpful information: the Variorum note to *Richard III*, and, indirectly, the reference to *Notes and Queries* in the Variorum note to *Venus and Adonis*. This reference is incomplete, and does not mention the first of the two notes, which is by Charles Sweet (pp. 364–5). There at last, seventy-five years ago, we find someone asking the pertinent question—

'But why should window signify an eyelid?'

The answer is simply that *window* could mean 'shutter'. The only alternative (suggested by Vaughan, *New Readings*, 1888, cited in

¹ The context shows that the 'windows' are to serve as firewood.

Richard III) is that of a window itself opaque, a window, for example, of horn; this alternative is I think eliminated by the remark in Harrison's *Description of England*, 1577, Bk. II, ch. 12, that 'horne is now quite laid downe' because 'glasse is come to be so plentifull'.

The correct meaning, 'shutter', is thus first suggested by Charles Sweet, in 1876. He bases his argument on the evidence of a fifteenth century chronicle in which it is recorded that 'fenestres' were used as shields, and from the parallel with Latin in which 'fenestra' could mean a 'shutter'. The second note in *Notes and Queries* collects all the relevant Shakespeare quotations and adds valuable further evidence from early dictionaries, of which these two, from Cotgrave, seem conclusive:—

'*Contre-fenestre*, a wooden window (on the outside of a glazen one) . . .
'*Volet* . . . a shut or wooden window to shut over a glasse one.'¹

Mr. Lawrence (who had not seen the notes in *Notes and Queries*) takes *window* as meaning 'shutter' but, I think wrongly, confines the application to shutters of shops. He is clear about the Shakespeare passages (1) and (5), and gives a further instance of the image of window-shutting used to imply absence of light, from Marlowe, *Tamburlaine* Part I, V, 2, 230. Professor F. P. Wilson has kindly pointed out to me a passage in Dekker's *Seven Deadlie Sinnes* in which the same sense is literally used (Percy reprints, 1922, p. 30). The *O.E.D.* incidentally supplies further evidence under *shop window*. Taking 'to open or shut (one's) *shop-window*' simply as a figure of speech meaning 'to begin or close the business of the day', the editors quote from an ordinance of 1646-7,

'the shopp windowes of all persons that trade in this Towne who are not sworn burgesses shalbee forthwith shutt upp'.

We know that the Elizabethans had shutters, for houses as well as shops; yet the word 'shutter' in this sense is not recorded before 1683, and the word 'window-board' not before 1628 (*O.E.D.*). They called their shutters 'shut windows' or 'wooden windows', or, more briefly, 'windows'. Perhaps Shakespeare ought strictly to have distinguished between 'glass window' and 'wooden window'; but he counted on the context to make it clear which he meant. He did not expect to be so carelessly heard or read as to have eyelids taken for eyes, nor, what is nearly as bad, to have a recurrent image so understood as to make nonsense.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

¹ Quoted in *O.E.D.* as the earliest example of *shut, sb.*

A SPEECH-HEADING IN *THE REVENGERS*
TRAGÆDIE

A wrong speech-heading seems to have gone hitherto uncorrected in Tourneur's *The Revengers Tragædie*. In V. iii, Vindice and Hippolito with 'two Lords more' enter as masquers and kill Lussurioso and his friends; then there appears another 'Maske of entended murderers', consisting of Ambitoso, Supervacuo, Spurio and 'a fourth man'; they find Lussurioso already near death, and the text then reads:

Spur. Whose groane was that?

Lus. Treason, a guard.

Amb. How now? all murderd!

Super. Murderd!

4. And those his Nobles?

Amb. Here's a labour sau'd,

I thought to haue sped him. Sbloud how came this?

Spur. Then I proclaime my selfe, now I am Duke.

Amb. Thou Duke! brother thou liest.

Spu. Slaue so dost thou!

4. Base villayne hast thou slaine my Lord and Maister.¹

Modern editions add the stage-directions '[Stabs AMBITIOSO]' and '[Stabs SPURIO]' respectively after the last two lines. This gives rise to several difficulties: (1) Supervacuo is not killed, but that he is dead is certain from the fact that he is not interrogated along with the 'fourth man' in the remaining lines of the play, and because Vindice would not have gloated over his deed until the last of his 'nest of Dukes' had been exterminated; (2) It is extremely unlikely that the bastard Spurio would risk proclaiming himself when the Duchess's sons were alive and ready with weapons in hand; (3) It is odd that Ambitoso should call Spurio 'brother'; (4) In V. i a struggle for the succession between Ambitoso and Supervacuo is suggested, but the text as it stands does not bring their quarrel to a head.

If, however, we read '*Spur.*' as an error for '*Super.*' and understand a stage-direction '[Stabs SUPERVACUO]' after Ambitoso's last line, the situation is clear. The text will then read:

Super. Then I proclaime my selfe, now I am Duke.

Amb. Thou Duke! brother thou liest. [Stabs SUPERVACUO.]

Spu. Slaue so dost thou! [Stabs AMBITIOSO.]

4. Base villayne hast thou slaine my Lord and Maister.

[Stabs SPURIO.]

¹ Punctuation as in Professor Allardye Nicoll's edition of Tourneur.

The contrivance of such a rapid sequence of revenges must have delighted Tourneur.

It may be that this alteration will lead us to restore the original text at the end of V. i. There Ambitoso and Supervacuo are speaking: the original quarto makes Supervacuo threaten death for Lusurioso and Spurio, Ambitoso remaining behind to remark in soliloquy:

Ist so? 'tis very good,

And do you thinke to be Duke then, kinde brother?

Ile see faire play, drop one, and there lies tother.

Exit AMBI.

Professor Allardyce Nicoll in his edition of Tourneur, thinking these lines better suited to Supervacuo, reverses the speech-headings and stage-directions so that Ambitoso utters the first threat and Supervacuo remains behind to hint at further slaughter. This necessitates altering four speech-headings and two stage-directions. But if the text in V. iii is to read as now suggested, it is fitting that Ambitoso should here threaten his brother.

CLIFFORD LEECH.

CORRESPONDENCE

MAYLAND (ESSEX)

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,

In his review of my *Place-names of Essex* (*R.E.S.*, xv, 120), Mr. G. V. Smithers writes: 'Occasionally Professor Ekwall [in his *Dictionary of English Place-names*] offers an earlier form than Mr. Reaney, as for *Mayland*, for which he adduces *Eiland*, 1181 (though without specifying his source), and which he etymologizes as *æt þæm eilande*; this is more convincing than Mr. Reaney's derivation from *mægþa* 'mayweed' which involves assuming that *-þ-* has been lost from all the recorded forms'.

Professor Ekwall *does* give his source for *Eiland*. It is from the Pipe Rolls. It refers, however, not to Mayland but to (Stoke by) Nayland in Suffolk. This is *Eiland* in Domesday Book and was partly in Suffolk and partly in Essex (v. *V.C.H., Essex*, i, 408). The identification is proved by the reference to Prittlewell Priory which held the church of Stoke with the chapel of Nayland (*ibid.*, ii, 139).

As for the etymology, OE *æt þæm eilande* would become ME *atten eyland*, *atte neyland*, *nayland* as in Nayland. Cf. the similar development which has given rise to such names as Noak, Nokes, Norchard, Nelmes, etc. So far as the present writer is aware, there is no example of the retention of the OE *m* of *þæm* which the reviewer regards as 'more convincing' than the etymology suggested for Mayland. The forms for this name are all comparatively late. The article immediately preceding Mayland in Ekwall's *Dictionary* deals with Mayford (Surrey) where forms are similarly late. The loss of *-þ-* in all these (which the reviewer finds so disturbing in Mayland) is paralleled here in Ekwall's suggestion that Mayford derives either from OE *mægþ* 'maiden' or OE *mægþe* 'mayweed'.

P. H. REANEY.

REVIEWS

The Living Chaucer. By PERCY VAN DYKE SHELLEY. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1940. Pp. viii + 331. \$3.00.

Chaucerian scholarship and interpretation is immensely indebted to the labours of many Americans, who since the pioneer work of Child have been in the forefront of those working to extend our knowledge and understanding of the poet. The names of Lounsbury, Kittredge, Lowes, Robinson, Young, Manly and Rickert remind us of what we owe to America in this matter, and a glance at any journal such as *P.M.L.A.* gives additional evidence of the way in which these scholars and their pupils are constantly adding to our knowledge of Chaucer's sources, biography, language, and many other matters, all designed to increase our understanding and appreciation of our author.

At the same time it must be admitted that any scrutiny of this mass of books and articles cannot fail to raise certain questions. Where is all this leading us? What is the effect of this vast body of research on the reader of Chaucer, be he specialist or 'the common reader'? A Kittredge or a Lowes, once in a while, shows one answer, for their work illustrates how all this learning can be lightly carried and made to inform and to help interpret every poem which they discuss. A lifetime of close reading of the French poets of the fourteenth century failed to overwhelm Professor Lowes: indeed he emerged from the combat as master, and Chapter III of his *Geoffrey Chaucer*, in which he shows in detail Chaucer's indebtedness to these and other authors, is sufficient evidence that in the hands of such a master learning and critical insight are constantly informing one another to the immense advantage of his readers.

But such scholars are rare, and Professor Shelley feels that the vast output of Chauceriana has often meant that we have lost the wood because of the trees, and that the poetry of Chaucer is liable to be forgotten. His book is a passionate plea for a more lively interest in Chaucer's poetry, and for a reading of a much wider range of Chaucer's work than is common, even among reasonably serious

readers. He is an enthusiast, ranking Chaucer next to Shakespeare in the poetic hierarchy, and his enthusiasm has helped him to write a good book on what I may call (without offence I hope) an old-fashioned method. That is to say, he takes us carefully, and with animation, through the body of Chaucer's work, explaining, eulogising, appreciating—yet keeping closely to the text in such a way that his work may well become a most useful handbook for those beginning a serious study of Chaucer. His analysis and discussion of the various poems naturally raise a number of points which one would like to question, or to see put in a different way, but on the whole it is admirably suited to fulfil his avowed purpose to bear in mind 'the general reader and lover of poetry more than the specialist'.

The first sentence of his Preface, however, indicates the serious limitations which he would impose upon himself and his readers. 'In the making of this book on Chaucer I have confined myself to a consideration of his poetry, and have said little or nothing about the man or his life or his times'. But can such an attitude be maintained in practice? Chaucer did not live *in vacuo*, but in fourteenth-century England, and although Professor Shelly argues that 'Chaucer the man of affairs is one thing, Chaucer the poet another', the separation is easier to suggest on paper than it could have been to effect in life. It was precisely Chaucer's wide experience of affairs, of many men and many cities, of camp and court, and all that went to make up his life, that made him the poet that he is, with all those qualities which Professor Shelly so eloquently recognises. Indeed, he seems to feel this himself in some paragraphs beginning on p. 315. But the matter cannot rest there. The knowledge of men and women which Chaucer had demands from the modern reader a continuous intellectual and imaginative effort to know and to understand likewise. Professor Shelly has clearly made such an effort, despite his disclaimer, when he tells us (p. 248) that 'the pride of [the Miller's] family is ridiculous enough, in view of its being based so largely upon the wife's illegitimacy'. His understanding of this does not come from any feeling for Chaucer as an artist, but from his knowledge of medieval Church law. This it is which enables him to understand the implications of the lines:

The person of the toun hir fader was . . .

She was yfostred in a nonnerye.

It is only by his study of medieval life and thought that the Professor knows, what Chaucer and all his original hearers knew, that parsons

could not marry, and that the Miller's wife was therefore the illegitimate daughter of a parson who consequently paid money for her marriage.

For an adequate appreciation of Chaucer, then, a love of poetry is not enough, since it will only take us part of the way, and we shall be constantly unaware of Chaucer's full intention. Chaucer was a highly sophisticated man writing for a highly sophisticated audience, and he made great demands on their knowledge and understanding of medieval life and customs. Professor Shelly, by his self-imposed limitation, is able to give us only a part—albeit an important part—of the total picture of Chaucer as an artist. For such a picture we must neglect no part of the medieval scene, and that means that the 'life and times' of Chaucer as well as 'the poetry of Chaucer' must be our study. Professor Shelly's book will serve as an enticement and a stimulus to many to set off on this long and arduous task.

H. S. BENNETT.

Middle English Sermons. Edited from British Museum MS. Royal 18B. xxiii, by WOODBURN O. ROSS (Early English Text Society, O.S. Vol. 209). London: Humphrey Milford. 1940 (for 1938). Pp. lxvi+396. 30s. net.

Dr. G. R. Owst's two admirable volumes on the medieval sermon have made students fully aware of the rich fields waiting to be explored by further investigation of the mass of sermon material available in public and private collections. Little of it has up to the present found its way into print, and the publication of this volume of *Middle English Sermons*, taken from the well-known MS. Royal 18B xxiii, is most welcome. The manuscript contains 55 sermons, of which only four have hitherto been printed, viz., Wimbeldon's sermon at Paul's Cross in 1388/9 and three sermons from Myre's *Festial*. The remaining 51 sermons are here printed with an introduction and apparatus by Professor W. O. Ross, who has given us a faithful transcript so far as I have been able to check it.

This collection is of a composite nature. We have a number of sermons which had actually been preached, as well as many others which were evidently designed to serve as models. An interesting indication that the sermon had been delivered may be seen at the end of No. 9, where the preacher says: 'Sirs, my lord shuld have preched here hym-selfe þat is here presente now, but he is a littil dezeved; and þer-for he ordeynt me to preche in is stede. And he

granteþ you as muche pardon as þoþ he had preched hym-selfe'. Many that give no indications such as this were evidently included as specimens of what was suitable for about half the Sundays and for various festivals and saint's days. Their construction is examined in a particularly valuable section by Professor Ross, who explains clearly the form of the 'modern' or 'university' sermon, and enables the reader more fully to appreciate the structural features and the considerable dialectical subtleties which the 'modern' method allowed and encouraged. The language of the MS. suggests that the sermons were written in the western part of Oxfordshire—a surmise which fits in well with the 'university' type of construction, and the nature of the contents of some of them. While no very precise date can be given to them, it seems clear that they belong to the period of the Great Schism—say 1378-1417, although they may not have been assembled until some time later, and the text before us probably does not date earlier than 1450.

The composite nature of the collection makes it necessary for us to revise Dr. Owst's description of the MS. as if it contained only sermons for humble audiences written by one 'unpretentious homilist'. While there are sermons, such as No. 13, couched in terms of 'charming modesty and self-distrust,' there are many others written for people of education and social position, and at the same time there is good evidence that the work of at least six authors is to be discerned, some of whom, far from being ignorant, are men of considerable erudition.

The student of the medieval sermon, therefore, will find plenty to interest him in this volume, but there is much for less specialised readers. None of us can be blind to the claims of fifteenth-century prose since Professor R. W. Chambers wrote his famous *Continuity of English Prose* essay, and this volume furnishes many passages to support his arguments. There are innumerable instances of that kind of prose, desired by Trevisa, which is 'clear, easy and plain,' while sustained argument is couched in cogent and logical terms. At the same time the need to interest and hold an audience is not forgotten. Homely illustrations abound: gluttons are constantly 'guldande in as a gredy sowe in þe draff stoke'; or men give opinions on 'every crafte and connyng, þoo he knowe no more þer-of þan can þe howle of musik'. Readers of Chaucer will note with interest the description of the ideal priest as a follower of Christ: 'For Crist hym-selfe fuste ded in dede, and aftur he taught in word'; while the Pardoner is recalled

in the description of those 'sothell theves þat slyly can robbe men with many queynt sotell wordes and with fals behestynges, and sum with false letters and seeles and crosses and reliques þat þei bere abowten þem, and sei þat þei be of seyntes bones or of holy mens clopinge and behotep myche mede þat will offre to hem, and hire þe letters of pardon ichon of oþur, as a kowe or a nox þat man lat to hire'.

The social historian will glean much, both grave and gay, as he reads of false quest-mongers, back-biters, the denial and sale of justice, the extravagance of the rich, the covetousness of men of Holy Church, or of the housewife at her Saturday-afternoon cleaning of her house, or of the great lord who came into church and saw a gentlewoman who 'satt on knees and red on hure primore; but ever as any man com in-to þe churche or vente owte sche loked aftur hem'.

H. S. BENNETT.

'*Nobilis, or A View of the Life and Death of a Sidney*' and '*Lessus Lugubris*.' By THOMAS MOFFET. Ed. with Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Virgil B. Heltzel and Hoyt H. Hudson. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library. 1940. Pp. xxiv + 146. \$3.75.

The two Latin works here admirably edited were discovered by Professor Heltzel in the Huntington Library in 1936. Their author Dr. Thomas Moffet (1553-1604) was a schoolfellow of Spenser's and after studying at Cambridge and Basle practised medicine in London and became one of the most celebrated physicians of his day, a pioneer in chemical medicine and entomology. He acted as personal physician to Essex during the Normandy campaign of 1591-2, and thereafter, probably in the same capacity, lived with the Pembrokes at Wilton till his death. *Lessus Lugubris*, an elegy on Sir Philip Sidney, and *Nobilis*, a panegyric on his life, were composed during 1593 for the young William Herbert, who went to Oxford in that year at the age of 13. Written in a highly wrought Euphuistical Latin they were clearly meant to stir the boy's emulation, to direct him into the path of study and high seriousness, by pointing out the splendour of his uncle's character and achievement. Since Moffet had known Sidney well and was intimate with his relatives, all that he says in *Nobilis* has authority, and though the didactic is uppermost in the well-marked divisions of his set oration, his portrait not only sharpens the view of the hero which we obtain from other

contemporaries but also adds some interesting sidelights on his life and interests. The editors confess that their translation cannot do justice to the verbal figures of Moffet's rhetoric, but it is adequate for reference, though rarely elegant.

As a child, we learn, Sidney showed marked individuality. 'When as a three year-old he beheld the moon, with clean hands and head covered he used to pray to it and devoutly worship—as if in his earliest years he had compassed the heavens with his mind, and wondered at the works of his Creator'. As Greville also asserted, he had a serious nature, but 'he possessed a gentle, tender disposition' and in later life was remarkable for his kindness and patience towards his servants.

'When he had scarce completed six years of life, measles and small-pox laid waste, as with little mines, the excellence and fashion of his beauty, and yet not in such wise that the residue was unbecoming to him'. This qualifies Ben Jonson's assertion that 'Sir P. was no pleasant man in countenance, his face being spoiled with pimples and of high blood and long'. Apparently unlike his nephew (so much is it stressed), Sidney preferred books to games. At school 'his bedroom overflowed with elegant epistles; the master commanded his delight and joy so far as he assigned passages for recitation to be drawn from ancient writers, or modern lore to be devoured.' Twice he fell ill—Moffet suggests through overstudy—and this is borne out by evidence from 1565 (Marshall's accounts) and 1570–2. At the University and at Court Sidney kept his passions under control, avoiding sloth, greed, self-seeking and sensuality—a rare model for young William, who, however, left Oxford after two years for the vanities of London, and before long caused a scandal by his *liaison* with Mary Fitton. At Court Sidney 'seemed both common and kingly', and rose by his seriousness as well as by 'wit, grace, elegance, learning and influence', giving up for affairs of state 'love, poetry, sport, trappings, lackeys, pages, carriages inlaid with ivory'. Yet Moffet admits that he spent great sums on his embassies and in entertaining foreign representatives, and on 'Christmas festivities and joustings, magnificently appointed, and then, with ceaseless liberality, upon learned visitors', though he was never happier than when, away from the Court, 'he might read and dispute somewhere in an inn with a few University men.' Married to Walsingham's daughter (it was a love-match, says Moffet), he awaited an heir with patience, and after two years, discussing her 'slight infertility' with the doctor, ascribed it to the

Divine Will. When she bore a daughter he proved a delighted and delightful father. He bore the deaths of his father and mother with manly fortitude, but showed the depth of his love for his sister Mary when she was reported mortally ill.

Sidney's martial accomplishments are praised to the skies. Moffet suggests that there was some difficulty in persuading courtiers to volunteer for service in the Low Countries. 'To live in clover at home, to hunt wild animals, to watch a hawk, to enjoy abundantly every sensual pleasure, far surpassed going down to the sea in ships, for the sake of aiding a neighbouring country and gratuitously running into fire upon reaching the shore.' Some had already fought in Flanders, 'with nothing but losses', and (like others since), 'having been treated badly by inhabitants and enemies alike' had 'brought nothing back but a herd of six-legged beasts and some livid scars' Sidney was wounded while trying to save his friend Willoughby who was hemmed in by 'an encircling host of enemies' and 'contending with nothing but his fists, could hardly fend off the slaughterer'. After professional details of the efforts made to cure him, Moffet ends with a peroration invoking Essex and others to testify to their love for Sir Philip and his endless fame.

Unfortunately the doctor has nothing new to say of Sidney's literary interests. He regards the *Arcadia* and Sonnets as youthful works later regretted, though he gives them perfunctory praise, and, like Greville, points out the moral qualities of the romance. Among the other works, he mentions some now lost, not only the translation of 'the *Week* of the great Bartas', but divers elegant letters in verse and prose to the Queen, 'but particularly to your honoured mother'.

The most novel aspect of Sidney's character noted by Moffet is his scientific interests. Wallace and others have mentioned his visits to Dr. Dee, but have assumed that they were concerned with astrology. Moffet, however, himself no friend of the art, declares that Sidney (like Greville) had 'a certain innate loathing' of it. He was passionately interested in chemistry; 'led by God, with Dee as teacher, and with Dyer as companion, he learned chemistry, that starry science, rival to nature', aiming to 'know with sureness the sure principles of things and afterwards apply them to the general good. Hence it happened that he himself made corrections upon various authors of scientific works, and by his methods led sundry to writing more correctly—or at least to observing more correctly', pointing out mistakes in Aristotle, Plato, Plotinus, etc.

The editorial notes are models of their kind, bringing out the (often dim) allusions of the text and supplying valuable information about the persons and incidents mentioned, e.g. about Sir Henry Brounker whom Moffet mentions along with Dyer and Greville as one of Sidney's closest friends. The Introduction includes useful notes on the other early accounts of Sidney. There is a good index to the volume, and the whole is handsomely produced.

GEOFFREY BULLOUGH.

The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. By HAZELTON SPENCER. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1940. Pp. xx+495. (No price given.)

Mr. Spencer does not attempt to swell the pile of learning about Shakespeare by contributions from sources hitherto untapped. He is well-informed, but his object is rather to present a digest for students, with a critical comment which is always lucid and balanced in substance, if sometimes perhaps a little jaunty in expression. He is no bardolater, and knows that the poet's work, even apart from the imperfect form in which it has often come down to us, was not always on the same level of greatness. *King Lear*, 'the grandest, the most titanic of Shakespeare's plays', and *The Tempest*, 'the flower of dramatic romances', move him to enthusiasm, but not *Coriolanus*, and not *Cymbeline*. He does not forget that Shakespeare, as one of a working company of actors, had not quite a free hand. 'It is clear that as a poet he was sometimes appalled by the limitations of his medium'. Mr. Spencer deals adequately with the conditions of theatrical representation in Shakespeare's day, and with what little is known or conjectured as to his private life. But upon the problem of the Sonnets he declines to expatiate. It will remain unsolved, unless new documents are discovered that will give us the facts. 'The sonnets will only tell us how Shakespeare felt about the facts. And that they tell us now—how, that is, Shakespeare chose *as an artist* to express and communicate certain moods of joy, longing, wonder, doubt, and despair. The truth and value of these beautiful poems do not wait upon the results of further research. He who runs may read them. He who has loved may rejoice in them. He who has suffered may be lifted up by them'. A critic must, I suppose, criticize. Mr. Spencer shares the current view that a play is essentially a thing to be played. I am not sure that it was Shakespeare's own view, since many of his plays are much too long for presentation without considerable cutting.

However this may be, I feel that too much space is given to historical records of theatrical revivals from the seventeenth century up to the present day, many of which resolve themselves into mere lists of forgotten and forgettable mimes. Nor do I think that Mr. Spencer should have accepted Dr. Tannenbaum's theory that the accounts of some of the plays in one of Simon Forman's manuscripts are to be regarded as one of Collier's forgeries. This is certainly not borne out by the condition of the manuscript in the Bodleian. And I dislike the practice, more common in America than over here, of supplementing the main discussion by numerous notes, which are relegated to final pages of the book. Nevertheless, when all is said, this is a competent manual, and should serve a useful purpose.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

Milton and his Modern Critics. By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. London: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. viii+74. 3s. 6d. net.

Logan Pearsall Smith's charming essay on Milton's modern detractors will doubtless please those people who like Mr. Smith's charming essays. Scholars will find his little book deliberately and shrewdly not very scholarly, and the gentlemen under attack will probably be more entertained than dismayed by such a purple onslaught.

Mr. Smith is half saddened, half amused by the threatened dethronement of his 'Prince of Language', and in his exquisite reply to our late fantasists he indulges the romantic luxury of an inadequate weapon. To the 'oblique' criticism of the poet's detractors he opposes wit and whimsicality. But *Milton and his Modern Critics* makes one serious point and makes it insistently. We encounter it in the opening pages and in the last; it is presented along with authorities, illustrations, and eloquent personal testimony. It is simple, it is familiar, but Mr. Smith feels an urgent need to remind us. Milton is the master architect of words. Milton will be immortal so long as 'there remain any readers who are sensitive to the grandeur and the loveliness of poetic sound.' His defence is solely and simply an æsthetic defence.

For the rest Mr. Smith delights himself and us with urbane digs at Messrs. Pound, Eliot, Murry, Read, Leavis, Dobrée (none of whom will greatly mind), and Richard Bentley (who will not mind either, being now case-hardened to posthumous punishment).

With ironic solemnity Mr. Smith informs us that a firm of professional wreckers—T. S. Eliot & Sons, Limited—has recently attacked the House of Milton and has, indeed, already convinced itself that the work of demolition is accomplished. Mr. Smith, having had seventy-odd years of experience with the over-confidence of human termites, assures us that the house still stands.

When a melancholy man puts an antic disposition on, one takes him seriously at one's peril; but Salmasius and Morus must stir unhappily in their graves at such a 'controversy' as this. Having survived nineteenth century criticism, with its clouds of idolatry piled mass on mass, must we now with fragrant platitudes of æsthetic (and no steel trap beneath) combat the nibbling of modern Miltonasters? Mr. Smith must know that the author of *Paradise Lost* could never have sanctioned a 'defence' which stressed his power over words and then expressed indifference to his power over thought. True, it is Milton's artistry that has been attacked; and Mr. Smith, although his theory of poetry differs radically from Milton's, has a perfect right to argue, as he does, that the way of saying, and not the thing said, is more important in poetry. Still, it is an inappropriate defence of Milton—of all poets—loosely to minimize the thing said. With England needing Milton's unconquerable will and passion for freedom at this hour, with the word-master's thoughts made timely again by the returning tide of history, it is fortunately unlikely that his literary detractors will seize upon Mr. Smith's inept concessions.

To those who can enjoy a defence, and an example, of graceful writing in a time of the breaking of nations, Mr. Smith's essay will provide a grateful hour. An artist in his own right, he can speak of Milton's sublimity and organ voice with unbelievable freshness. Even scholars, who may not relish refurbished commonplaces of criticism, should welcome nevertheless a study of a great artist in which, for a change, he is actually treated as an artist.

(The American edition, an Atlantic Monthly Press publication, issued by Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1941, is a revision of the English edition. There are numerous stylistic improvements, some corrections of error, and a few interesting additions and deletions.)

WILLIAM RILEY PARKER.

The Works of George Herbert. Edited with a Commentary by F. E. HUTCHINSON. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1941. Pp. lxxviii + 619. 30s. net.

It was never in doubt that Canon Hutchinson's edition of the Works of George Herbert would maintain the high standard set by the Clarendon Press Editions of Donne, Crashaw, Marvell and Vaughan. The high expectations of lovers of the seventeenth century lyric are here amply fulfilled. Biography, critical apparatus, text and commentary are alike excellent.

To establish the text Canon Hutchinson had to exercise his judgement on the two MSS., *MS. Tanner 307 in the Bodleian Library* (designated as B) and *MS. Jones B 62 in Dr. Williams' Library, Gordon Square, London* (designated as W), and the *editio princeps*, 1633. Of the three he rightly decides that B 'brings us nearer the author's text than anything else that survives,' since it is a copy in a Little Gidding hand of the 'little book' which Herbert, on his death bed, gave to Edmund Duncon to convey to Nicholas Ferrar. On the other hand W has an especial value; it is written by an amanuensis, but 'there are very many corrections in the author's unmistakable hand'. However, 'since they do not represent the author's final judgement' (only 69 of the 164 poems in *The Temple* are found in this MS.) Canon Hutchinson concludes that 'an editor is not free, as Grosart held himself to be, to adopt its readings at pleasure, but only for especially cogent reasons'. He does so in three instances only, in each case recording the variant readings and explaining his decision. The principal value of W to the editor is 'to corroborate the readings of B where they differ from 1633, or to support 1633 where it has corrected a slip of B; it is also useful for checking the rather capricious and defective punctuation of B.' Canon Hutchinson gives his own reasons for thinking it likely that the *editio princeps* was set up from the B manuscript, a probability which confirms him in following B wherever it differs from the first edition, unless it is obvious that the difference represents the correction of a copyist's slip. Often he has been able to confirm the existence of such a slip (he finds twenty-eight in all) by reference to W; 'where a slip is suspected and W contains the passage, the earlier manuscript is free from the error'. But whereas Canon Hutchinson is mainly relying on B for the text, he follows the 1633 edition in spelling, punctuation, use of capitals and italics. 'The justification lies both in the deficiencies of B and the unusual excellence of 1633 . . . It was good fortune for *The Temple*

to be first printed by Thomas Buck, the best printer that Cambridge had yet had'. Such are the general principles followed in this edition; but, as Canon Hutchinson says, it is not enough in dealing with *The Temple* merely to reproduce either B or the first edition. 'To have lived in close familiarity with the two manuscripts and the first five editions of *The Temple* for now ten years may encourage the present editor to hope that the text, as it is here presented, is nearer to what Herbert intended than what has hitherto appeared.' This is a claim which every reader will grant; moreover, if any wish to exercise their own judgement to corroborate or to dispute that of the editor, he has provided them with all the material by his full collation of the manuscripts and early editions.

Canon Hutchinson examines, in his introduction, the more important modern editions of Herbert's work, and, in particular, *The English Works of George Herbert* edited by George Herbert Palmer in three volumes, 1905, hitherto the most valuable edition, to which he pays grateful tribute, especially for its Introduction and Commentary. He notes, however, the imperfections of the text, which is particularly unreliable as regards punctuation, and he puts forward a cogent argument against Palmer's rearrangement of the poems into what he claimed to be at once a probable chronological and an illuminating psychological order. Palmer arranges them in three main divisions—Cambridge, The Crisis, and Bemerton—and makes five subdivisions within each of the main sections, representing 'a classification according to the subject matter of the poems', but claiming also to be 'largely chronological'. Against this arrangement Canon Hutchinson raises two serious objections. In the first place, the suggestion that Herbert went through one period of crisis, the result of his hesitation to enter the priesthood, is misleading. 'It is possible', Canon Hutchinson writes, 'that Palmer over-emphasizes the conflict of mind about the priesthood, and that Herbert's spiritual struggle was over the more general issue of his submission to the Divine will'. This view is amply confirmed by the poems themselves. The second and even more important objection to making any change in the traditional order is that that order, in part at any rate, represents the poet's own intention. It cannot be accidental that *The Temple* opens with *The Church Porch* and closes with 'Love bade me welcome'; moreover, as Canon Hutchinson indicates, certain juxtapositions, with which Palmer's order interferes, represent a close relation of theme. For instance, *The Sacrifice*, with its refrain "Was ever

grief like mine?' is followed by *The Thanksgiving* which opens with:

Oh King of grief! (a title strange yet true,
To the of all King's onely due)
Oh king of wounds! how shall I grieve for thee,
Who in all grief preventest me?

and the poem *Longing* 'with its plaintive cry at the close, "My love, my sweetnesse, heare!"' is immediately followed by *The Bag* which begins "Away despair! My gracious Lord doth heare". Palmer's arrangement is based on the assumption that in certain periods of his life Herbert was consistently restless and in others at peace, whereas the evidence of the poems suggests much rather that he was 'a man of moods'. 'He is resilient and passes quickly from fits of depression to reassurance; the saddest poems either end with harmony restored or are followed immediately in the original order by a poem in which he recovers peace of mind.' Moreover, Herbert's poetry ought not (any more than Donne's *Songs and Sonets*) to be treated as biographical material, but as a work of art. And, while the arrangement of the *Songs and Sonets* appears to be accidental, and each poem, therefore, must be considered as a separate entity, Herbert's *Temple* was clearly arranged by him, to some extent at any rate, in a deliberate order, so that a pattern emerges from the whole. Even one instance of such purposeful arrangement would be enough to justify the decision to retain the traditional order, but in fact there are many. Whilst all students of Herbert will share Canon Hutchinson's grateful admiration for George Herbert Palmer's edition, none, I imagine, will dissent from his rejection of the re-arrangement.

In his Preface, Canon Hutchinson quotes Dean Beeching's declaration that 'No poet except Donne is in such need of a commentator as Herbert'. Herbert's obscurity and Donne's arise from different causes. Herbert rarely draws his images from recondite sources, and no study of the Scholastic Fathers or of contemporary theories in chemistry or astronomy is needed to understand him. His medical images are homely and familiar. Sometimes, however, special knowledge is required, particularly of legal terms and of the technical language of duelling or of the game of bowls; all this is admirably supplied by the present editor. Moreover Herbert's intimate knowledge of the Bible is matched by Canon Hutchinson's own, and the meaning is often sharpened and deepened for the reader by a reminder of the Biblical associations of certain words and phrases.

Most often, however, difficulties in interpreting the text arise from slight changes in the meanings of words ('even the plainness of Herbert's diction is sometimes deceptive, because words still in familiar use to-day are used by him in senses which are now obsolete'), or from Herbert's habit of extreme compression and of using a word in two senses, one of which may easily elude a reader who is not sufficiently vigilant. Canon Hutchinson's Commentary is of immense assistance in overcoming these varied difficulties; he rarely omits to elucidate passages which are obscure for any of these reasons. As far as I am aware there are not more than three instances of such omissions. When, in Letter VII (p. 370), Herbert writes to Sir John Danvers about the advantages of the office of Public Orator at Cambridge, 'he takes place next the Doctors, is at all their Assemblies and Meetings, and sits above the Proctors, is Regent or Non-regent at his pleasure, and such like Gaynesses, which will please a young man well,' not all, even of his academic readers (and perhaps none but they) will fully understand the meaning of Regent and Non-regent. Line 72 of the poem *Providence* (p. 119),

Clouds cool by heat, and baths by cooling boil,

seems to me obscure, and has no comment. Palmer suggests 'Clouds produced by the sun's heat, become cooled and descend to form fresh springs. And springs can boil up in obedience to inner heat only when they at the same time send off from their cool upper surface that vapor from which they are ultimately resupplied'—an explanation whose value depends upon how much Herbert and his contemporary readers can be supposed to have known about geyser springs (the earliest entry under geyser in the O.E.D. is 1763). Did Canon Hutchinson reject this as too complicated and leave the line unannotated because some simpler meaning appeared self-evident to him? A more important omission (as it seems to me) is the absence of any explanation of lines 13 and 14 of that beautiful and elusive poem *The Answer* (p. 169). Canon Hutchinson explains certain words and phrases in the poem, but omits to suggest what Herbert means, at the close, by:

to all that so
Show me and set me, I have one reply,
Which they that know the rest know more than I.

Palmer's summary of the subject matter of the poem is lame and unconvincing: 'Life passes. My work remains undone. Men call me

dilatory. There has been reason for the delay,—though what it is I cannot say.' Such vagueness is entirely unlike Herbert. Professor F. P. Wilson has suggested to me that *the rest* in the last line may mean, not only, the rest of Herbert's life story summarized in the poem, but also 'the freedom from toil or care associated with the future life.' See O.E.D. Sb. 4 (b) as in Sidney's version of Psalm xv:

'In Tabernacle thine O Lord who shall remaine?
Lord of thy holy hill, who shall the
rest, obtaine?'

If this be so (and such a pun is most characteristic) then Herbert's *one reply* is, I suppose, that the angels and blessed spirits know, even better than he himself does, whether or not he could reply to his critics, 'I am God's servant despite all my losses and failures'. One would much like to know Canon Hutchinson's opinion. But the remarkable thing is not that the Commentary should occasionally leave the reader unsatisfied, but that it so extraordinarily rarely does so.

'Herbert', Coleridge wrote (*Notes and Lectures on Shakespeare*, 1849), 'is a true poet, but a poet *sui generis*, the merits of whose poems will never be felt without a sympathy with the mind and character of the man', a statement at once true and misleading. It would be difficult to read Herbert's poetry, or his prose, without acquiring a 'sympathy' with his well-ordered, gracious mind and his disciplined character, for these things reveal themselves not only in what he says, but in the precision of his language and the firm and varied structure of his verse. But it is not necessary for such personal feelings towards the man to *precede* the study of his writings. 'Herbert is a true poet' because he can communicate his shrewd, discerning wisdom, his delicate moral sensibility and his passionate moods through the medium of poetry. It is a great pleasure to re-read him in an edition so well worthy of him, nor is there any poet, of similar compass, who could better deserve or reward his editor's scholarly devotion.

JOAN BENNETT.

English Song-Books 1651-1702. A Bibliography with a first-line index of songs. By CYRUS LAWRENCE DAY and ELEANORE BOSWELL MURRIE. London: printed for the Bibliographical Society at the University Press, Oxford. 1940 (for 1937). Pp. xxii+439.

The advance of the bibliographers continues in spite of the war. Tract by tract, the lesser known regions of English literature are

being explored and—broadly or minutely—mapped. With all that has been accomplished in recent years, 1940 would have become memorable, bibliographically speaking, if only for the publication of the great *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, whose general and ready reference will for a very long time to come place all students in its debt. And now, with the same year on its title-page, there comes from the Bibliographical Society (but, unfortunately, issued to members only) yet another welcome volume, *English Song-Books 1651-1702*, the work of two American scholars, C. L. Day and E. B. Murrie. This survey, strictly limited to those song-books which contain musical settings, covers, of course, only a tiny corner of the immense field of the Cambridge volumes; but does so with a different aim that demands an almost microscopic treatment of detail, as foreign to the purpose of the larger work as it is right and proper to itself. Yet, notwithstanding the closer scrutiny to which this particular section has thus been subjected, the student of song-books will be disappointed if he expects to find any discoveries of importance in the more recent work; for, as a comparison of the two lists shows, it has added no new title to those which fell within the scope of the *C.B.E.L.* and are there recorded—many of them for the first time. The moral would appear to be that extremely few extant song-books of the period remain still to be discovered. The authors of this volume, however, have had the happy thought of including, each in its chronological position, a number of titles of vanished song-books, by which means space has been reserved for volumes which may yet come to light.

Every author has, of course, the right to delimit the aim and scope of his own work. Some regret, however, will probably be felt in this instance that a too rigid exclusion of 'collections of sacred songs' has banished such an important and characteristic song-book of the period as *Harmonia Sacra* of 1688 and later, which contains songs as 'unsacred' as Quarles's lullaby, 'Close now thine eyes, and rest secure', Flatman's 'Oh the sad day', and the anonymous 'Come, honest sexton', to name only a few. On the other hand, although the authors claim to include 'variant issues', they have omitted to mention under *The Banquet of Musick . . . The Sixth and Last Book*, 1692 (Book 112), the variant in the Royal College of Music which omits not only the engraving on the title-page but also an 'advertisement' on the reverse page. Similarly there is no record (under Book 148) of the issue of *Deliciae Musicae . . . The First*

Volume Compleat, 1696, in Mr. Harding's possession, which contains *Three Elegies*, 1695. Nor is it stated that a copy of *Three Elegies* itself (Book 141) is to be found in the British Museum. It is also, perhaps, worth noting that the Bodleian copy of the first—or 'Widow Howell's'—issue of *Musica Oxoniensis*, 1698 (Book 164), is not, as the authors suppose, unique, there being at least two other copies in Oxford, namely, one in Christ Church and the other in the possession of Mr. G. A. Thewlis; and, lastly, that a copy of Matteis's *Collection of new Songs*, 1696 (Book 143), is also to be found in Mr. Harding's library.

But although there are no surprises amongst its recorded song-books (except perhaps the few omissions cited above), this volume contains many unexpected features of the utmost value for research and reference, which combine to make it a remarkable achievement. In addition to a minute bibliographical description of every 'secular song-book' of the period they could lay hands on—which, with the 'lost' books, total 252 items—the authors have also compiled an 'Index of First Lines' of all the poems contained in them, amounting to 4150 entries—a noteworthy work of reference in itself. But that is not all; for each entry includes, wherever possible, the names of the composer of the music, the writer of the words, and the first singer of the song, as well as its source or first publication, its date, and a list of its appearances in the other song-books. And then, not yet having done enough for scholarship, the authors conclude the volume with a series of admirable indexes in which 'Composers', 'Authors', 'Singers and Actors', 'Tunes and Airs', 'Sources', 'Printers and Booksellers', are dealt with separately, not to mention an index of the 'Song-Books' themselves.

With the best will in the world to carry out such a project, and an assiduity and patience equal to it, the authors are under no delusion that they have filled every lacuna and furnished every desirable detail of information. Such a task would require years of team work. Yet it is notable that a fairly close inspection of several sections of the work suggests that the proportion of error in this enormous aggregation of minute details is extremely small. And the following few additions and corrections which the present reviewer is able to contribute to the 'Index of First Lines' should be regarded as a grateful, if trifling, supplement to their work, and not as any implication of failure. The items are given in the order of the Index, thus—

Song 65. 'Ah me to many deaths decreed.' As this song is stated (rightly)

to have appeared in August 1692, 'The source of the words, Crowne's play *Regulus* (1694) . . . supplied within square brackets' at the end of the entry, is not only unnecessary but actually wrong. Delete the foregoing sentence on p. xix, and the reference to *Regulus* on p. 166.

177. 'Andrew and Maudlin Rebecca and Will.' 1656 is cited as first printing; but it seems to have appeared earlier in *Mercurius Democritus*, June 23-30, 1652 (see *Cavalier and Puritan*. H. E. Rollins, p. 61).

484. 'Catch me a star that's falling from the sky.' Beaumont's *Poems*, 1640, is named as source. The poem also appeared anonymously in 1640, in *Wits Recreations* (Epigram 161), with its first line reading, 'Go catch a star that's falling from the sky.'

490. 'Cease fond Amintas to complain.' This poem appeared nine years earlier than the alleged source. It was claimed by Mrs. Aphra Behn as hers and published by her in *Miscellany*, 1685.

710. 'Come sweet lass.' Various people have asserted this to have been first printed in 1685 (see *Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, N. Ault, p. 491); moreover, when *Wit and Mirth*, 1699, is actually cited by the authors as the earliest text, why do they then name *Wits Cabinet* [c. 1700] as its source?

827. 'Dearest do not now delay me.' The Beaumont and Fletcher 1647 folio is named as the source. The song was not printed in the text until the 1679 folio. H. Lawes' *Ayres*, 1653, is the earliest known printing.

962. 'Farewell fair Armida my joy and my grief.' This song also appeared, in 1672, in *Covent Garden Drollery*.

990. 'Fie Chloris 'tis silly to sigh thus in vain.' This is attributed to 'Dr. Waldren' (d. 1702) by Nichols (*Select Collection*, iii, 1780).

1160. 'Go you tame gallants you that have the name.' 1656 is the date of the earliest source named. G. Thomason had a copy of it in June 1642 (see the 'Thomason Tracts', G. K. Fortescue, i. p. 128), and the pamphlet itself is dated 1642.

1172. 'Good folk for love or hire.' Anonymous, 1641, should be corrected to—Drayton, *Poems*, 1619.

1199. 'Great good and just could I but rate.' This appeared five years earlier, in the 1654 edition of Cleveland's *Poems*.

1209. 'Greedy lover pause awhile.' The third stanza of this poem had appeared as a separate song five years earlier in *Wits Interpreter*, 1655.

1455. 'How severe is forgetful old age.' This song appears in two other collections of the same date, viz. *Westminster Drollery*, 1671, and *Windsor Drollery*, 1671.

1578. 'I pass all my hours in a shady old grove.' *Westminster Drollery*, 1671, is given as source; the song also appeared in *Windsor Drollery* of the same year. 'Charles II (?)' is named as author, without evidence or reference. The song was in fact issued as a music sheet, entitled, 'The Phoenix. A Song the words by King Charles the 2^d set to Musick by Mr. Humphres Under whom was Educated the late famous M. Henry Purcell'

(B.M., H.1601). At Longleat, however, there is a transcript of the song, headed, 'Mr Dridens first Song at Court' (Portland Papers, Vol. XIX).

1599. 'I spend my sad life in sighs and in cries.' This is stated in *The Grove*, 1721, to have been written by 'Dr. Kenrick'.

1863. 'Jewry came to Jerusalem.' *Cantus, Songs and Francies*, 1662, is named as the source. The poem had appeared much earlier as a ballad 'Printed by the Assignes of Thomas Symcocke,' circa 1729 (B.M., Roxb. Coll. 1. 394-5).

1938. 'Lawn as white as driven snow.' Anon., Wilson's *Cheerful Ayres*, 1660, cited as source; this should be corrected to—Shakespeare, *Winter's Tale*, 1623.

1939. 'Lay by your pleading the law lies bleeding.' This was first printed as a black-letter broadside in 1659 (Bodleian, Wood 401).

1983. 'Let not thy beauty make thee proud.' Almost certainly written by Aurelian Townshend (see *A Treasury of Unfamiliar Lyrics*, N. Ault, p. 624, n. 199).

2043. 'Like a dog with a bottle fast tied to his tail.' This song appears in another collection of the same date, *Windsor Drollery*, 1671.

2347. 'No poor suffering heart no change endeavour.' The date of source is given as 1693; *Cleomenes*, in which the song was first printed, was published in 1692.

2385. 'Now God above that made all things.' This was written by John Wade (fl. 1662).

2445. 'The nymph that undoes me is fair and unkind.' *A Collection of Poems*, 1672, is the original source, not 1673.

2572. 'Of all the torments all the cares.' William Walsh was stated to be the author of this in *The Works of Celebrated Authors*, Vol. II. 1756.

2636. 'Only joy now here you are.' *England's Helicon*, 1606, is given as source; the song appeared in *Astrophel and Stella*, 1598.

2856. 'Says Roger to Will.' The authors cite nothing earlier than 1719 as source. The song had appeared previously at least twice; first in *The Monthly Mask*, December 1709; and next in *The Merry Musician*, 1716.

3114. 'Sure 'twas a dream how long fond man have I.' Probably written by Sir R. Freeman (see *Aurelian Townshend's Poems*, ed. E. K. Chambers, p. 115).

3167. 'Tell me not I my time misspend.' Attributed to 'Phill King' in B.M. MS. Harl. 6917.

3298. 'Thou joy of all hearts and delight of all eyes.' First printed in *A Perfect Collection of all the Songs Now in Mode*, 1675.

3453. 'To you fair [To all you . . .] ladies now at land.' After mentioning its inclusion in *Wit and Mirth*, Vol. v. 1714, the authors cite *The Merry Musician*. I. 1716 as the source of this famous song. It had, however, previously appeared in *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations. By Several Hands*, 1712; and a single music sheet of the song in the B.M. (H. 1601), is dated conjecturally [1707?].

3621. 'What ails the old fool.' Anonymous and dated 1686 by the authors, this song first appeared as a broadside set to music, dated 1685, and entitled, 'The Miser. Written by the Author of the "Old Man's Wish"', that is, by Dr. Walter Pope.

3784. 'When rich men die whose purses swell.' First printed, not in *Wit and Drollery*, 1682, but in *The Mysteries of Love and Eloquence*, 1658 (p. 92).

3809. 'When this fly lived she used to play.' This is by Thomas Carew.

3877. 'Whilst I am scorched with hot desire.' It is not clear why *Miscellany Poems*, 1. 1702, is cited as the source of this song, following a statement that it is included in *The Gentleman's Journal*, November 1692.

3934. 'Why lovely boy why fliest thou me.' This poem was first printed in Henry King's *Poems*, 1657, where it is stated to have been written by 'Mr. Hen. Rainolds.'

3950. 'Why should we boast of Arthur and his knights.' This ballad is in the Pepysian Collection, and is dated 1612.

4020. 'The world's a bubble and the life of man.' This poem was written by Bacon, and was first printed in T. Farnaby's *Florilegium Epigrammatum Graecorum*, 1629.

But although such oversights or mistakes might with some ill-luck happen to any researcher, the authors cannot be entirely acquitted of carelessness either in copying out or proof-reading their transcripts of a number of title-pages which are actually facsimiled in their volume. A glance at page xiv is enough to show that their chief aim throughout the work was to maintain a scrupulous correctness of detail (the one fundamental requisite of bibliographical technique). When, therefore, it is discovered that as many as eight of the twenty-eight title-pages reproduced have been faultily transcribed—though it may be only in the substitution of a full-stop for a colon; and when three of these eight transcripts are found to contain three or more mistakes each, such carelessness, besides being blameworthy in itself, constrains the reader to wonder about all those other transcripts which he cannot so easily collate and verify. These faulty transcripts should be corrected thus—

Book 18. *Cantus, Songs and Fancies*, 1662. In imprint: 'Anno. Dom.' should read 'Anno Dom.'

Book 71. *Pastoralle*, [1684]. In title: 'beginning' should read 'beginning'.

Book 89. *A Collection of the Choyest . . . Songs*, [1687]. In title: for 'Bass-Violl' read 'Bass=Violl'; in imprint: for 'Covent-Garden' read 'Covent=Garden'.

Book 135. *A Second Booke of Songs*, [1695]. A vertical 'line-bar' has

been omitted; thus 'Fowr Voices' should have been printed 'Fowr | Voices'.

Book 155. *A Collection of new Songs*, 1697. In title: for 'Mr' read 'M^r'; in imprint: for 'Church=Yard' and 'Freemans=Yard' read 'Church-yard' and 'Freemans-yard'; and for 'j. 6' read 'j. 6'.

Book 166. *Orpheus Britannicus*, 1698. In title: for 'Britannicus.' read 'Britannicus:'

Book 190. *A Collection of new Songs*, 1701. In title: for 'M^r' read 'M^r'; and for 'i d' read 'j 6'.

Book 198. *The Judgment of Paris*, [1702]. In title: for 'the Music-Prize | by M^r' read 'the | Music-Prize | by | M^r'.

And in addition to the foregoing, a complicated mistake on page xix should be rectified. In the paragraph beginning 'Song 65 appears . . .', the number '144' should be corrected to '114' in three places; and the sentence 'the source . . . square brackets' should be deleted (see note on Song 65 above).

The numerous illustrations are things of beauty in themselves, many of them, and a joy to possess. Most are said to reproduce unique title-pages and are therefore especially valuable. Among the plainers of the engraved title-pages, displaying lettering only, are no less than four, from different books published between 1697 and 1702, all having the same title, and—though the authors fail to note the curious fact—all printed from the same plate (see figs. 33, 40, 42, 44). In each, the title remains constant to this extent: 'A | Collection | of new | Songs | With a Through Bass to each |'; after which follows, by successive erasures and additions, the variable part of the sub-title. And as a large portion of the imprint also remains unaltered, the same publisher (needless to say) is responsible for this thrifty proceeding. It may also be noted in conclusion, that in the employment of the illustrations a certain lack of co-ordination is occasionally apparent between the figures and the authors' comments. This is found most annoyingly in connexion with the illustrations of music notation (figs. 15–18) and the discussion of them (pages xii–xiii); for there is nothing to indicate, in text or plate, either which figures are referred to, or from what books they have been taken.

In producing this volume, however, the authors have provided students of the Seventeenth Century with so much invaluable information, that, in spite of some few blemishes here and there, it is sure both of an immediate welcome from them, and their gratitude in years to come.

NORMAN AULT.

Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale). By JAMES L. CLIFFORD. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1941. Pp. xx+492. 21s. net.

The last twenty years have disclosed an astonishing wealth of information about Dr. Johnson and his circle. During this time the Boswell papers have been published, the Fettercairn House papers have been discovered and catalogued, Birkbeck Hill's edition of the *Life of Johnson* has been revised, and A. L. Reade's *Johnsonian Gleanings* have reached a ninth volume. The study of Mrs. Piozzi and her works during the same period has had less spectacular results but has been no less thorough. The *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* has provided some indication of what is to be found in the great collections of Piozzi manuscripts in that library, and Mrs. Thrale's *French Journal* and many of her interesting marginalia have been published. *Thraliana*, her six-volume commonplace book, is still known to most of us only by the excerpts published long ago by Hayward and by Hughes, but an edition is in the press and a new edition of her *Anecdotes* of Dr. Johnson is promised. And now comes Mr. Clifford with a biography of Mrs. Piozzi, for which he has traced and examined manuscript material in some twenty-five private collections apart from the collections in public libraries. The amount of hitherto unpublished material in Mr. Clifford's book is very striking indeed. Much of it is of course taken from *Thraliana* and from letters and journals in the Rylands library, but there is one manuscript source of paramount importance whose existence the present reviewer at least was previously unaware of, a five-volume commonplace book in the possession of Sir Randle Mainwaring entitled *Poems on Several Occasions*. This book was started by Mrs. Piozzi in 1810. Into it she copied her poems, and interspersed them with 'long autobiographical explanations . . . more chronological than *Thraliana*'. This important source is referred to by Mr. Clifford as Mainwaring Piozziana. A catalogue of this manuscript material, together with a census of letters sent to and from Mrs. Piozzi and a bibliography of the writings which she herself published, will be found well set out in appendices.

A reviewer cannot hope to check Mr. Clifford in the use of these manuscripts, the greater part of his work. But his methods engage the reader's confidence from the start. How much credence, we may ask, remembering what Boswell thought of Mrs. Piozzi's inaccuracies, can be placed in the evidence of the extant *Thraliana* and *Piozziana*? How valid are her accounts when compared with those

of other writers of the day? By way of answer Mr. Clifford not only considers the whole question of Mrs. Piozzi's reputation for inaccuracy (see, in particular, pp. 265-272), but he also examines (pp. xviii, 357) the trustworthiness of Fanny Burney's diary, Anna Seward's letters, and Boswell's 'day-by-day accounts in the *Life*', showing that the printed versions do not accord with what was written at the time, and he comes to the sensible conclusion that for a record of what actually happened and when it happened, he must rely upon contemporary evidence rather than upon later recollections. Accordingly he quotes from Mrs. Piozzi's journals or letters in preference to her autobiographical accounts, and from the Boswell Papers rather than from the *Life of Johnson*. The accuracy of Mr. Clifford's quotation from printed sources and the judgment he shows in selection and presentation confirm one's good impressions. When examining these more accessible sources, one is pleased to notice how often Mr. Clifford refrains from repeating an entertaining, yet irrelevant, anecdote, and how often he avoids swamping his pages with additional facts which would have yielded but a meagre contribution to the story and character of Mrs. Piozzi which he is recreating. In short, Mr. Clifford's scholarship is of a high order, and he knows how to write.

It may be asked, indeed it has been asked, whether such a woman as Mrs. Piozzi deserves the labours of such exemplary scholarship. There can be little doubt of what a considered answer must be. In the first place, Mrs. Thrale's house in Southwark and her villa at Streatham were Dr. Johnson's homes, and it has long been recognized that Boswell saw too little of this side of Johnson's life to represent it adequately. Therefore any scholar who helps us, as Mr. Clifford has helped us, to reconstruct Johnson's domestic background has done a useful piece of work. Secondly, Mrs. Piozzi led a busy, at times even a giddy, social life; and while reconstructing this, Mr. Clifford has added considerably to our knowledge of English (and Italian) society between 1760 and 1820. Thirdly, Mrs. Piozzi was an unusually self-conscious woman, who found pleasure in making a copious record of the state of her feelings and opinions. From her published writings, but more especially from her notebooks and journals and letters, it is possible to recreate her enigmatic personality. This Mr. Clifford has done so well, that even those who can find little in her to admire should be ready to admit the plea of *humani nihil* . . . when confronted with so detailed and so revealing a study.

A final word of praise must be given to the index. The entries under the principal names have been sensibly and thoroughly analysed, and so far as the reviewer has checked this part of the work he has found neither errors nor important omissions.

JOHN BUTT.

A Bibliography of the Works of Edward Gibbon. By J. E. NORTON, London: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. xvi+256. 21s. net.

Bibliographers are human after all. They have a natural desire to see their knowledge shared and appreciated. Their good fortune has been that the more stern and exacting the standards of their abstruse work have become, it is from that very fact that the best bibliographies of recent years have been able to attract general interest without making any concessions to popularization.

Among such works Miss Norton's book deserves to rank high. If she has made no sensational discoveries, she has established herself as a first rate bibliographer and a leading authority on Gibbon. After constructing her foundations with exhaustive labour and acumen, she has written an informative and enjoyable book which is invaluable as a survey of the historian's literary life and of the *Fortgeschichte* of his works.

Mr. Blunden once innocently remarked that 'the bibliography of Gibbon is brief and straightforward.' It has been Miss Norton's pleasure to show that the enquiry has proved not very simple and far from brief, and it has been her merit to suspect and discover much in a field which had been hardly thought worth exploring. The chapters of this book consist of introductory essays describing the circumstances in which each item was published, followed by the relevant collations of editions. The author has not scrupled to range beyond purely bibliographical problems, and she has wisely but temperately yielded to the inevitable temptation to quote Gibbon himself. Yet her work is by no means discursive; she keeps very strictly to each successive point.

Only a few of many topics can be touched on here. Some plausible assignments between Gibbon and Deyverdun of the articles in the *Mémoires Littéraires* are made, though the author wisely falls back on Gibbon's own assertion that after many years it was impossible to distinguish precisely the fruits of such a close collaboration as was theirs. The most important contribution of the early chapters concerns

the *Mémoire Justificatif*. Miss Norton not only solves the problem of the date of this work, where Gibbon himself was misleading, and incidentally clears him from Wilkes's calumny that he wrote this paper in order to obtain place; she shows that the earlier document in French, delivered to the Spanish Government in July 1779, was revised by Gibbon. To what extent he worked on it is not clear. She suggests, however, that this memorandum should be included in any future edition of Gibbon's works.

It is not, however, the opuscula which afford the greatest bibliographical interest, as often happens with an author's works, but the great history itself. From first to last Miss Norton devotes some seven chapters to it. We know from literary sources that the first edition of Volume I was planned to consist of 750 copies, then 500, and finally 1000. The last decision was made only when the printing had begun. Exact corroboration of this has come from a collation of many copies. In some of these the type of the first twenty-six sheets of the text and of the first two sheets of the notes is differently set, the misprints have been corrected, and certain leaves which are cancels in other copies here form part of the original gatherings. Clearly these sheets were printed after the decision to increase the edition. If the popularity of the first volume exceeded expectation, the next two went more slowly, as Gibbon foresaw they would. Miss Norton shows that, apparently to stimulate sales, a 'second edition' of them published in May 1781 was in fact only the sheets of the first edition issued with new title pages. Further, although a new edition of all three volumes was advertized in 1782, no such copies of volumes II and III are known, and in fact there was no new edition of them until 1787.

A pertinent digression follows in the form of a survey of the extent and nature of contemporary criticism of *The Decline and Fall*. This leads up to an equally useful chapter on the *Vindication*. The collation of the octavo editions must have been perhaps the severest part of the author's researches. The labour was worth while, as was that on the abridgements and translations. Though this bibliography does not profess to go beyond 1838 strictly speaking, it does in fact mention most of the important editions and Gibboniana down to present times. In this respect the reviewer ventures to correct two points in order to give two modern publishers their due. The World's Classics edition of the Autobiography published in 1907 should be credited to Mr. Grant Richards who founded that series. When the Gibbon papers were acquired by the British Museum in 1894, the late Sir

John Murray contributed to their purchase and was assigned the copyright of the unpublished manuscripts. The acquisition of these papers was therefore not Lord Rosebery's sole benefaction, as Miss Norton seems to imply.

The chapter on the Miscellaneous Works is one of the most valuable and just. We have an entertaining account of the fiery Lord Sheffield's activities as an editor. One omission may be noted. Gibbon's juvenile exploit, *Lettre d'un Suédois*, which he circulated cautiously among his Lausanne friends, was published in Switzerland at some time after the appearance of the Miscellaneous Works.¹

A final word of commendation must be given to the Oxford University Press for the production of this book. Gibbon himself would surely have been pleased.

D. M. Low.

Charles Reade: sa vie, ses romans. By LÉONE RIVES, Docteur ès Lettres, Ancien Professeur au Lycée de Pointe-à-Pitre. Imprimerie Toulousaine (Lion et Fils), 1940. Pp. 525.

Dr. Léone Rives's biographical and critical study of Charles Reade is the most comprehensive and systematic work that has yet been produced on this out-of-fashion but by no means negligible Victorian author. It contains some very interesting new material. Dr. Rives has studied minutely the 'enormous mass' of Reade's note-books in the London Library and has had access to private papers and unpublished letters. She has elucidated, among other points, the autobiographical bearing of the early novel *Christie Johnstone*, as to which Reade's misleading hints are recorded by Coleman in *Charles Reade as I knew him*, and the ten-year series of holidays in Scotland is now accounted for. The fisher-girl, whose beauty and courage are commemorated in the novel, was the mother of Charles Liston, Reade's son, and was probably married to Reade according to Scots law. Indeed, it does not seem that this resentful victim of a celibacy enforced by the conditions of his Fellowship at Magdalen was ever long without a stable and domestic, even though imperfectly sanctioned, union with a woman. Within a few years of 'Christie's' death in 1848 he had met the actress, Laura Seymour, and was sharing

¹ When the Miscellaneous Works were published in 1796 attention in Switzerland was attracted by *Lettre d'un Suédois*, which Gibbon had written during his first residence in Lausanne, and circulated in MS. It reflected the views of those Lausannois who wanted to break free from Berne. Most of it was reprinted in Henri Monod's *Mémoires*, 1805, vol. I., 45-8.

a house with her. This relationship, which Dr. Rives reasonably refuses to regard as Platonic, in spite of the warm assertions in the family *Memoir*, lasted till 1879, when Mrs. Seymour's death drew heart-broken letters from Reade and left him an old man, without any desire to go on writing. If we also accept Dr. Rives's suggestion of an autobiographical element in the *Cloister and the Hearth* (the child born after a formal betrothal and the separation of Margaret and Gerard through Gerard's celibate vows) and remember that Reade enjoyed the income of his Fellowship, rising to £600, for nearly fifty years, residing at Oxford as little as possible meanwhile, we must admit that he found out how to eat his cake and have a large piece of it, and, moreover, how to extract from its flavour a stimulating grievance. But it is unlikely that the impulsive, generous, unreasonable man regarded his situation in this light. No new facts have appeared concerning the sumptuous beauty of Durham, Lilian, who, according to Coleman, sacrificed herself in marriage to a brute, eloped with a curate, pointing out to Reade in a letter the chance he had missed, and henceforward sent him from California yearly cases of 'peaches, pears, apples and apricots, and an occasional brace or two of canvas-back ducks.' That there was some substance behind Coleman's gossip is suggested by the entry in Reade's diary made on 15 July 1852 at Durham and quoted in the family *Memoir*. The woman, 'beautiful as the dawn, and madly in love with a man hideous as midnight, and not one idea in his skull,' whom he records having met, can hardly be anyone but Lilian. Coleman says that it was her mother's friend, the Governor of Durham gaol, formerly a Government Commissioner in Australia during the gold rush, who introduced Reade to prison life, and Lilian herself who saw in his conversation the material for the play, *Gold*, which Reade set about writing immediately and on which he afterwards based *It is never too late to mend*. Mrs. Seymour told Reade, who was always mistrustful of his imagination, that he needed stimulus before he could launch himself into literary work. She probably meant the stimulus of ascertained fact and the emotion, indignant or admiring, roused by it, that propelled him into all of his major novels and plays; but, could the map of his emotional life be fully unrolled, it is probable that we should see that a second stimulus, that of a woman's sympathy, was also required. *Masks and Faces*, was written during his infatuation for Mrs. Stirling; it was at Durham that he wrote *Peg Woffington* and conceived *Gold*, and the stimulating effect of Mrs. Seymour's

friendship during the years of his greatest output is amply evidenced. Stimulus and judgment, however, are two different things, and Quiller-Couch may be right when he suggests that the theatricality which was Reade's besetting sin was, if not encouraged, at any rate not checked by that daughter of the theatre, and that he was never really safe from its incursions except when he was writing alone in his rooms at Magdalen. It was there that most of the *Cloister and the Hearth* was composed.

The critical part of Dr. Rives's book consists of a chapter on Reade's technique, thorough enquiries into society and history as they appear in his novels, and a chapter on the psychology of his characters, which is much shorter, but still somewhat long for its subject. It is not as a creator of characters that Reade has survived, and even his descriptions of the outward signs of love and jealousy, which Dr. Rives selects for praise, do not count very much towards his survival. It is most valuable to have an ordered account of the events, public and private, that incited him to deal in fiction with various social abuses. He was, Dr. Rives says, 'as incapable of seeing another endure an injustice as of supporting it himself;' and *Hard Cash*, *Foul Play* and *It is never too late to mend* are, under one aspect, a form of social action, utilitarian novels intended to stir up public opinion and hasten legal change, in which aim, as she shows by chapter and verse, they were successful. The public recognized him as a crusader, and among his note-books she has found a letter, begging him to undertake in the press a campaign against tight-lacing; the subject was duly introduced into the *Simpleton*. It seems that a thick substratum of actual fact was needed before Reade's imagination could begin to build. An equivalent substratum sustains the historical novels; his object in them was to tell the truth about the conditions, manners and point of view of the past, as far as he could retrieve it from documents of the past; he filled three of the gigantic cards he used for notes with close columns of facts about hermits before he wrote the pages describing Gerard's life in his cell, and enjoyed thinking that he was the first to exhibit in fiction a hermit as he really was. He admitted that he found invention very difficult. Always his search is for 'real, warm facts,' and it is from brooding on them that he distils the 'oil of fiction' the lack of which he deplores in *Christie Johnstone*. It is interesting to hear from Dr. Rives that only a small proportion of the material gathered into the note-books was ever used. It was the exercise of amassing and sorting

it that engendered the creative heat; when the flame was well alight it did not need all the stacked fuel to feed it. Reade himself, while certain that the best fiction has always been the result of a union of fact and imagination, had moments when he perceived that it was dangerous to surcharge fiction with facts.

Dr. Rives's work is so solidly and intelligently done, is the fruit of such minute attention and so responsible a judgment, that it must take its place as the authority on Charles Reade's life and activities. There is still perhaps room for a short essay on the working of his imagination, so dependent on external incitements, so apt to be infected with a bad stage tradition, yet at times so triumphant. Quiller-Couch sees Reade as a master of epic narrative, distracted too often from his real work. Dr. Rives is well aware of the problem, keeps up a running fire of allusions to it, and endeavours to suggest by what stages the classifier of documents becomes the artist; but her points are scattered through a book in which, inevitably, more attention is paid to Reade's 'matter-of-fact' than to his 'romances.'

The book is provided with a useful bibliography of Reade's work and of critical appraisements of it. It may be suggested that Fielding had preceeded Reade in the application of dramatic technique to fiction, not to speak of such minor eighteenth century novelists as Cumberland and Mrs. Inchbald; and that Mrs. Radcliffe's romances, with the exception of the slight *Sicilian Romance*, do not take place in mediæval Italy.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

German Criticism of Flaubert, 1857-1930. By E. E. FREIENMUTH VON HELMS. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Pp. x+104. 6s. 6d. net.

The Germans were at first utterly unable to appreciate Flaubert; but when, early in the present century, they at length realized that he was a genius, they pointed exultantly at his Norman blood and Viking physique, and pronounced him a genuine Nordic. Flaubert had unwarily let fall certain remarks on his innate affinity with the character and outlook of the northern races. "Au fond je suis Allemand," he says in his letters; and German critics are never tired of quoting, "Je suis un barbare." In a sense, of course, they are perfectly right; though we can imagine what Flaubert would have said to the implication that he was more brute than human. He appeared as a novelist at the time when Freytag and Keller were

the leading realists in German literature, and he was far from supplanting them. A little later on, after the war of 1870-1, the Germans were convinced that Victor Hugo and George Sand were the only French writers who could hold a candle to their Spielhagen, Auerbach, and Heyse; Flaubert was nowhere. At the time of his early vogue in France, they regarded the scandalous *Madame Bovary* as both immoral and dangerous. They were stirred by *Salammbô*; but found *L'Éducation sentimentale* chilly. As to *La Tentation de St Antoine* and *Les Trois Contes*, they paid them scant attention, and it is only fair to remember that these received strangely little from the French reviewers. The first German to be anything like fair was Julius Schmidt, the literary historian, though he fell into misunderstandings that had to be corrected by Paul Lindau (1871). At Flaubert's death there were hardly any obituary notices in German; he had been ousted from general favour by Zola, whose spurious ascendancy began to totter only about 1891, when Paul Ernst remarked that the discriminating were going back to Flaubert, the Goncourts, and Stendhal. Max Nordau, however, who, like so many others, could make nothing of the posthumous *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, quotes Engel as saying that there was a small congregation of worshippers in Berlin who venerated Flaubert as their Grand Lama. This novel, of course, has puzzled many French readers, not to mention Englishmen, even to the present day. M. G. Conrad and Georg Brandes were ahead of their time (1881-2) in asserting Flaubert's greatness and originality, the former with somewhat ill-balanced enthusiasm. Engel showed intelligence, but only by fits and starts, and was one of those who are too ready to believe that it is the master's style and only the style that makes Flaubert unique.

Mr. Freienmuth von Helms punctiliously traces these ups and downs of the great Frenchman's reputation, giving chapter and verse and exact dates in his footnotes and bibliography. His documentary evidence is almost overwhelming; but he adds a most necessary index. At the coming of the new century, Flaubert was an accepted classic; his popularity was checked by the Great War, but it revived, and "reached its peak in the decade following." Heinrich Mann, an alleged imitator, analysed Flaubert himself, calling attention to his "nihilism" and his hatred of life, which had been noted by Nietzsche already. Analysis of such an apparent compound of discords proved very difficult in other hands also. One critic came to the conclusion that "humanist" was the only term for this

inscrutable being, but with the strange caveat, "strange as this appellation may seem." Another went silly over *Bouvard et Pécuchet*, which he took to be a "Menetekel" on popular education; it should certainly be a "Menetekel" to undiscerning critics. But the baffling problem was to reconcile the supposed union of the romanticist and the realist, the seeker after artistic perfection with the hater of the world which he lived in and depicted with such indefatigable patience and truth. Eugen Lerch compared Flaubert to Pascal, urging that he disciplined the romantic in himself till he was capable of the heroic feat of writing *Madame Bovary*. Richard von Schaukal in 1921-2 examined the parallel between the contemporaries Flaubert and Dostoevsky, and contrasted the humble, Christ-like figure of the Russian, the "radiant affirmer of life," with the "hater and gloomy denier of life," whose works are "mere literature." The fallacy here, and it is by no means confined to the criticisms examined by our author, is due, surely, to a failure to discern Flaubert's deep and aching sense of the imperfection and even the utter repulsiveness of life as it is compared with human capacities and pretensions. "Romanticism" is the wrong word for his disillusionment, his hatred and rebellion towards the frailties, the folly, and ignobility that have made the world what it is. "Romanticism" is too suggestive of imaginative licence, idealism, illusion, even some frivolity rather than stern seriousness. But the recoil into itself of a great and magnanimous nature was a recoil into the ascetic austerity, the stoical restraint and calm of pure art. Hence the sardonic comedy of *Bouvard et Pécuchet* and what is often taken for the moralistic severity of *Madame Bovary*. It is a universal tendency in man, who finds through art alone that perfection which is his deepest craving.¹

ERNEST A. BAKER.

Hardy of Wessex. His Life and Literary Career. By CARL J. WEBER. New York: Columbia University Press; London, H. Milford. 1940, 1941. Pp. xii+302. \$3.00; 20s. net.

For some years past the name of Carl J. Weber has been familiar in connection with parts of Hardy's life and writings treated in scholarly style; and without ingratitude to Dr. W. R. Rutland and his two accounts, one extensive and erudite, the other concise and general, of Hardy altogether, without forgetting the second Mrs. Hardy's

¹ Why is the *e* in *Remy* given an acute accent, but not the *e* in *début*? How does the author pronounce these words, so as to show the different sound of that letter?

two volumes forming an indispensable sourcebook, we may welcome this new biography. It is excellent to have Professor Weber's steadily assembled knowledge and interpretation of the subject all arranged in one good-sized but not overgrown volume. The time has come when the biographer of Hardy need not be hampered in saying what he knows or believes by natural reluctance to cause agitation or displeasure at Max Gate. 'On this centennial occasion it is possible for the first time to trace the literary career of the man with intimacy and assurance.'

In fact, even to the investigation of Professor Weber, little has been revealed about Hardy that was not either plainly stated or curiously implied somewhere in extant memoirs or in Hardy's prose and verse. The principal fabric of the new biography is not remarkably different from that of, say, Hardy's own short account of himself in 'Men of the Time', with what is commonly known of his later years, abandonment of novel-writing, advancement as poet and grand old man of letters, and the rest. Many will feel, have felt, that behind much that Hardy wrote there must have been some personal dilemma or disenchantment, which compelled his artistic and transforming utterance. That insistent quarrel between love and social distinctions which he worried at in his early fiction might probably have been known to him at first hand; but, if it was so, the record has been well concealed, and even Professor Weber has not found a name, or date, or place particularly belonging to it. The poems 'In Tenebris' appeared to Dr. Rutland to shadow some painful experiences towards the years 1895 and 1896, but there is no published detail of these, and whatever the secret was it appears likely to remain a secret.

At the same time, we have all of us heard that the first Mrs. Hardy was not quite as beautiful, as gay, as loving in middle age as she had had been in the days of Lyonesse. Hardy had told us something of the decline of their romance, and of the loneliness into which both she and he retreated at length, in some remarkably unshadowy poems. But since the last phase of his novel-writing became so exceedingly lavish of the inconsolable (and some have argued that but for E. L. Hardy he would have been almost a merry-maker in literature) it is inevitable that biographers should be still endeavouring to reconstruct the married life at Max Gate as an influence on Hardy's outlook and intention. Professor Weber has a chapter on the matter, and one which may be pointed out as an example of good bio-

graphical study. Some of the reporting, it is true, which he brings together is not of much significance, being fragmentary and isolated in kind and sometimes emanating from gossips of notorious talent for snappy stuff. But the general line is obvious. Incidentally, there is a story about the first Mrs. Hardy and 'Jude the Obscure' which is not in the other books, and might now be smiled over without harm to anybody. Alarmed by what she read of the manuscript, and failing to persuade the author that he should throw it away, she journeyed to London in the hope that Richard Garnett would undertake to overcome Thomas Hardy's obstinacy. In spite of such antics (perhaps it could be argued that they were performances of duty) Professor Weber's chapter is written in the sense that 'Thomas Hardy and his wife were neither cruelly mismated nor enthusiastically enraptured with each other as life partners'.

Perhaps we should regard with some degree of seriousness the literary rivalry towards Thomas Hardy which visitors now and then detected in his wife. She too was an author, and the world was not being quite fair about it. Her poems got as far as the local newspaper, but Mr. Hardy even did not rejoice much with her, and he did not seem to mind that her novels, or long stories, lay unenjoyed 'somewhere at the top of the house'. Where are they now? If they have quite vanished, at least we have had some specimens of the first Mrs. Hardy's authorship. In 1911 she wrote down some early recollections, parts of which are printed in 'The Early Life', including a final paragraph of a mystical character; and in 1912 she published at Dorchester a volume called 'Spaces', which no doubt is not to be purchased to-day, but is represented by Professor Weber in an Appendix. No matter what her husband thought about purblind Doomsters, she was better informed. She foresaw the Last Day, its clouds and darkness, its floating bodies in phosphorescent oceans, its graveyards thronged with moving figures, and its electric lights; beyond that, a Heaven of 'lightness of body and ease of locomotion—whether by wings or otherwise'.

Every chronicler of Hardy brings in some particulars which the others either overlook or discard, and Professor Weber has a great many, none of them perhaps of great importance by itself, yet all contributing to the life of the whole. His deficiency in this respect occurs towards the close of his book and of Hardy's life, if indeed he did not deliberately choose to look on the last decade as a quiet time—but it was then that Hardy, if he did not often travel many miles

beyond his garden and Stinsford church, was many a day in great form with friends worthy of his conversation. I remember for instance one of T. E. Lawrence's appearances in his drawing-room, with Mr. Siegfried Sassoon—and the discussion was led by Hardy. Then again the last public speech by Hardy, when he laid the foundation stone for the new Dorchester Grammar School originated by an earlier Thomas Hardy, was reckoned a very fine achievement and greatly applauded by his Wessex folk. But the interstices of Professor Weber's book are indeed well filled with circumstance, and if one example is to be given it should probably be the intricate yet clear information provided on the preliminaries for 'Tess' and the peculiarities involved in the publication of that masterpiece serially and then in three volumes. The biographer makes the suggestion that Lamb's 'Rosamund Gray', brief though it is, was in Hardy's mind in designing his love tragedy. Certainly Hardy enjoyed Lamb's work, and there may be some phantasmal kinship between Angel Clare and Allan Clare, as also between the villains who in each story destroy 'a pure woman'. The allusion to Lamb might be extended to a comparison between one or two of his poems and those of Hardy. 'Going or Gone' is a title which might belong to either man's pages.

In his appendices Professor Weber summarizes the painters mentioned by Hardy in his novels and the quotations that he makes from English literature. These tables will be of use to their maker or to others in further critical work on Hardy's means of appeal in description or in emotion and sensibility. They will grow, of course, as they are used; and Professor Weber will not complain of revisions. He says, for example, that 'not a line of Scott's poetry is quoted'—but several of the headings in 'A Pair of Blue Eyes' come to mind as being from Scott, perhaps by way of the 'Golden Treasury', a work which nobody ever knew better than Hardy. If such notes as this seem to hint that Professor Weber's main text is not often productive of general criticism, let them be understood otherwise. He speaks for himself on many aspects of his author's work, and is no blind worshipper of 'The Dynasts'. Yet his great merit is to have written a good biography with plenty of detail and still with clear progress.

EDMUND BLUNDEN.

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. By Sir WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: H. Milford. Part VIII (D—Dignite), 1938, pp. 120; part IX (Dignosce—Dull), 1940, pp. 121–240. 21s. net each.

Undisturbed by war circumstance Sir William Craigie continues to issue new parts of his *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*. Parts VIII and IX cover the letter D down to *Dull*. These two parts include a high proportion of words of Latin or learned origin involving the prefixes *de-* and *dis-* and comparatively few words of essentially colloquial origin. As editor of the U-volume of the *O.E.D.*, Professor Craigie had already faced the task of handling all the words beginning with *un-* in the English language and doubtless he found the *de-* and *dis-* words, in the Scottish tongue, so far as they also give the negative to the rest of the dictionary, a comparatively easy business.

In looking through the columns of these parts one notes a goodly number of forms which present phonological difficulties or are irregular in formation such as *dale*, *dai(l)l* for *dele*, 'share', *dask* for *desk*, *deme* for *dame* and *disagyse* for the more usual *disgyse*. Other strange forms are *dalmes* for *dames*, 'damask', and *dalphin* for *dauphin*, but these are more readily explicable.

As always there is a greater wealth of Latin and French formations than those found in the older English language of that time. Among the Latin ones we may note *deacceptable* for 'unacceptable', *discorsion* denoting 'hostile movements', and *disheredation* for the act of disinheriting. Among the French terms we may note *devanter* for an apron, *dowariare* as a variant form of *dowager*, and several names of materials coming from France such as *demigrane* and *demiostage*. Several are much more common in Scottish than in English usage and we have much fuller articles upon them than those found in the *O.E.D.* We may note *dishant*, 'neglect, discontinue', *diton*, 'phrase, motto', *dittay*, 'statement of charge, indictment' and *disjune* for the first meal of the day, immortalised for us by the famous disjune of His Majesty King Charles the First at Tillietudlem.

There are a number of words of Gaelic origin such as *davach*, *dawach*, *dauch*, 'measure of land', *dilse*, 'edible seaweed', *dipin*, 'section of a fishing-net', *dorloch*, 'quiver for arrows', *drammock*, 'mixture of water and meal', but they are all of a highly technical character and by this very restriction of meaning show how little the Gaelic language influenced Scottish speech as a whole. Words of

Scandinavian origin are almost equally rare. The chief are a small group containing the element *dom*, 'judgment, court of judgment' found in law terms from Orkney and Shetland. Such are *domerawo*, 'fine for contempt of court', *domismen*, 'members of an assize', *domlad*, 'laid before the court', all from Orkney, *dounraxter*, 'casting down', from Shetland. Scots speech has always shown itself apt at forming expressive compounds. A good example is *dead-kist* or *-chist* for a coffin.

The common use of *Danskin* for Danzig itself and as an adjective to describe a person or thing coming from Danzig is of special interest in present-day circumstances, and it is interesting to note that while according to the *O.E.D.* we first spoke of a *dialectician* in the 18th century, our keenly argumentative Scottish brethren were using the term already in the days of John Knox.

ALLEN MAWER.

Studies for William A. Read: A Miscellany presented by some of his Colleagues and Friends. Edited by N. M. Caffee and T. A. Kirby. University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press. 1940. Pp. x+338. \$4.50.

Professor Read was born in 1869, educated at the Universities of Virginia, Göttingen and Heidelberg, and has spent most of his teaching life in the Louisiana State University as head of the department of English. He has long been distinguished in the fields of American Dialect and Place-Names studies, and his publications have dealt mainly with the Place-Names of Louisiana, Florida and Alabama, with special reference to French and Indian sources. The *Festschrift* presented to him by his friends, however, is a witness to his wider interests.

The ideal *Festschrift* is also a book in its own right, which gathers together a more or less closely linked series of studies in one special field or period and provides the reader with a homogeneous body of critical material. Such tributes are few: the *Seventeenth Century Studies* for Sir H. J. C. Grierson is the only recent one which springs to mind. Otherwise they tend to be repositories of casual trifles or burying-places of isolated essays whose worth deserves a more relevant setting.

The present volume is justly named a Miscellany, but though it contains perhaps no essay of first-rate importance, it has little that is perfunctory or shallow. On the linguistic side the two most obviously

interesting are A. C. Baugh's *Thomas Jefferson, Linguistic Liberal* (which shows how a President of U.S.A. studied Old English and opposed the ideal of a fixed, undeveloping language set up by Swift and his followers), and Louise Pound's *American English Today* (which, showing the effects of nationalistic tendencies, traces the decline of class-differences in speech, of formality in prose, and sums up the influence of headlines, journalese, the cinema and advertising on modern vocabulary). The more specialist articles include notes by Eilert Ekval *On Place-Names in M. E. Writings*, analysing several MSS. and arguing, *inter alia*, that 'a good case might be made out for Cambridge as the place where three texts such as *Genesis and Exodus*, *The Bestiary*, and *Dame Sirip* originated'; a discussion by J. Hoops of the variant spellings of the name Shakespeare; and an examination by Kemp Malone of the forty 'phonemes' of current English.

The literary essays include a provocative lecture by Max Förster on *The Psychological Basis of Literary Periods*, in which he asks for a philosophical point of view towards literary history, as 'a guide to the formation of a *Weltanschauung*', and offers a scheme (Renaissance, Rationalism, Romanticism) which he bases, not on fashionable sociological grounds, but on the psychological assumption of 'polar reaction', i.e. that ages as well as individuals tend to suffer complete reversions in mental attitude. This 'law' he illustrates by reference to the present swing over from overemphasis on individual feeling and fanciful imagination' to 'overemphasis on collectivism', and by a sketch, on familiarly superficial lines, of the contrast between Augustanism and Romanticism. Perhaps the most valuable study in this part of the book is A. Turner's *Hawthorne's Methods of Using his Source Materials*, where the notebooks and fragments are used to throw light on Hawthorne's habit of taking some central idea, relating it to incidents from his own experience or reading, and embodying it by 'choosing significant episodes from the lives of his characters and making these indicate the successive stages of the story', while preserving in the main 'a vague atmosphere, to clarify their symbolism and yet keep them out of the realm of real life'. W. A. Montgomery's study of Milton's *Epitaphium Damonis* and its classical models is also a fruitful discussion, with its comparison with *Lycidas* to suggest 'the deep and lasting effects of his Italian sojourn upon Milton's classicism.' A. J. Bryan considers Ambrose Philips's *Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester* ('an otherwise deservedly neglected play'

based on *Henry VI, Pt. 2*) as an adaptation for propaganda against Atterbury and the Church. R. B. Heilman, in *The Sentimentalism of Goldsmith's 'Good-Natured Man'* refutes the suggestion that in it the author fell into the sentimentality against which he was protesting. J. R. Swanton gives a translation from Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo* of the first description of an Indian tribe in the territory of the present United States.

These articles are all scholarly and well written. It is right that they should be mentioned here lest they be overlooked by students in their respective fields.

GEOFFREY BULLOUGH.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. (Vol. XXV, 1939.) Collected by Percy Simpson. Oxford, at The Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. 115. 7s. 6d. net.

Professor Garrod is a little sharp with Housman as though with a promising but wayward pupil. 'He was sixty-one,' he exclaims, 'and yet not one jot of advance can you ascertain whether in technique or idea upon the Housman of thirty-five.' You can still discern the influences of Kipling and Stevenson; you still find him brooding—ah! upon what? That plough in Greats? Mr. Garrod clings to the certainty that no unhappy love, perhaps no love at all entered the poet's life. Such a view is no longer tenable since the tantalizing revelations of Mr. Percy Wither's book. In any case Housman remains and will remain an enigma, as he himself intended. Mr. Garrod concludes by playing the game of criticism by Housman's own rules. These lead him to pick out Arnold, Stevenson, Housman, and Brooke among the poets of the last ninety years, and at the same time to claim something more significant than personal favouritism for his choice.

A brilliantly revolutionary paper on the *Kingis Quair* by Sir W. A. Craigie opens up a road for further studies. Scholars had held that the language of this poem was essentially Scottish and that the text had been corrupted by attempts to anglicise it. Sir William argues that the poem was written in English by a youth who had been in England since his eleventh year, and that the patriotic fervour of Scottish scribes later substituted northern forms and idioms as far as possible.

The authenticity of a letter said to have been written by Sir Walter Raleigh to his wife from the Tower in 1603 is ingeniously upheld by Miss Agnes M. C. Latham. The MS. is not an autograph. Miss

Latham believes it to be genuine, but to have been deliberately concocted by Raleigh himself. Though not every one will agree with her conclusions, her essay will have to be carefully weighed by all future students of Raleigh's temperament.

The outstanding piece of this volume is Mr. Geoffrey Tillotson's learned and illuminating discussion of Eighteenth Century Poetic Diction. He shows with acute insight that 'the reasons why eighteenth century poets use the diction share in the central reason why they write poetry at all'. Particularly valuable are his illustrations of the affinity between prose and poetical language at this time. His examination of Virgil's influence might be carried further. It would be valuable to study the part played by Greek metres in shaping Latin poetical diction, and then to trace the influence of the Latin elegiac poets upon the older English poets. It is much to be hoped that Mr. Tillotson will expand this valuable study.

Professor Pinto's essay on Realism in English Poetry is an agreeably discursive pendant to Mr. Tillotson's concentrated enquiry. Realism is always an elusive term, and one may doubt if the professor has made it clearer by associating, for instance, Hardy and Housman as realists. Hardy, yes. But Housman? It is also odd not to find Masfield among them.

Finally Mr. C. L. Wrenn offers a study of the marginalia in a medieval manuscript belonging to Jesus College, Oxford. It is an interesting excursion into the bye-ways of scholarship.

The editor, Mr. Percy Simpson, may be congratulated upon successfully rivalling his predecessors in the scope and quality of the essays which he has collected.

D. M. Low.

SHORT NOTICES

The Shakespearian Tempest. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. London: Oxford University Press. (Oxford Bookshelf). 1940. Pp. x+332. 6s. net.

This work, first published in 1932, has now been reissued in the "Oxford Bookshelf" series. For some reason it was not noticed in the *Review of English Studies* when it first appeared; the publication of this cheaper edition affords an opportunity of making amends for that omission. Mr. Knight, it will be remembered, finds in Shakespeare a "tempest-music opposition". Tempests, taken in opposition to music, "form the only principle of unity in Shakespeare." This opposition is further developed in such contrasts as winter with summer, night with day, rain with sunshine. Tempest imagery, too, spreads out into "an imagery of universal disorder: comets and meteors, earthquakes, and such like: which again may blend with 'disease' imagery"; and music is "enmeshed in other pleasant suggestions, especially delicate airs (to be contrasted with tempests), flowers, gold, jewels, and all rich stones." All this was worth pointing out; and if it scarcely throws the exclusive shaft of light on Shakespeare's mental processes that Mr. Knight supposes, it none the less provides an illuminating approach to Shakespeare. Yet Mr. Knight is in some danger of crying, "Here is the key to Shakespeare!" when, in fact, he has only opened the door to one of the rooms. Though he frankly admits that his tempest-music opposition is not peculiar to Shakespeare, and that indeed it occurs throughout Elizabethan literature, he nevertheless insists that it is so characteristic of Shakespeare that "if we regard his work as a whole from this view, we focus an especial Shakespearian unity unlike that of any other poet." The acceptance or rejection of this assertion is vital to much of what Mr. Knight wants to prove in this book. Yet had he been writing about Marlowe, for instance, instead of Shakespeare, would he not have found ample material for the same sort of study as he has made here? And might one not come to the conclusion—approaching the problem from an angle that Mr. Knight would deplore—that Marlowe's magnificent intuition of disorder, contrasting with other passages of romantic beauty in his plays, was directly responsible for stimulating a mode of perception which affected one Elizabethan dramatist after another?

Mr. Knight's virtues as a commentator on Shakespeare are a really intimate knowledge of his author, a sensitive response to the values of poetry, an ability to penetrate to the full significance of the poet's meaning and to realise all (though at times perhaps more than all) its implications. His faults are a prose style that has the effect of a voice pitched too high, and a willingness to leave the solid ground of rational argument for an emotional region of Carlylian rhetoric; a dangerous tendency to abandon criticism for a sort of inspired chant; a proneness to pontificate ("The imaginative study of Shakespeare has not yet properly begun"). One tires, too, of a book which is made up so largely of quotations; and one wearies of the monotonous insistence on the same points, supported though they are by different citations. What would have been admirable in an essay becomes tedious when pursued in detail for three hundred pages. Stunned by Mr. Knight's incessant fusillade of quotations, one is prepared in the end to concede him everything. One has the impression, too, that one has been reading a Ph.D. thesis, far more intelligent and sensitive than the average, but still a thesis, with all the relentless accumulation of evidence that one associates with the candidate for a doctor's degree. Yet some, at least, of those faults will not be perceptible to all of Mr. Knight's readers, or will be indignantly repudiated. He is, in fact, a critic with whom, to a quite unusual degree, one must be in temperamental agreement if one is to do justice

to his very real merits. He has undoubtedly found a public—no doubt fit, and by no means few; he is not everyone's taste.

J. R. S.

Bibliographie der wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen Max Försters. Besorgt von HERBERT SCHÖFFLER. Bochum-Langendreer: Verlag Heinrich Pöppinghaus O. H.G.-. 1939. Pp. viii+87. 2 R.M.

This bibliography of the work of Max Förster was principally intended as a token of the affection and gratitude of his very numerous scholars for presentation to him on the occasion of his seventieth birthday on March 8, 1939, but it has much more than the interest of the ordinary record of a scholar's achievement, for surely there can be few scholars in any country whose work can show such variety combined with knowledge so highly specialized in every branch. The items recorded in the list number 825, and among other subjects they cover articles, notes, and reviews concerning such widely differing subject-matter as phonetics, Old and Middle English, Shakespeare, the literature of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, English music, Celtic folklore, the theory and practice of education, and many others.

Much of Professor Förster's work, such as his Celtic studies, has been concerned with subjects beyond my ken, but I have long been accustomed to reading with a particular attention all reviews to which I saw his name appended. He has always seemed to me the perfect reviewer, in the combination which he seemed able always to bring to his work of profound knowledge of apparently almost all subjects—he would nearly always *add* something to the information of the book reviewed—with the gift of presenting a clear picture of what the author had achieved, or failed to achieve, of a kind which must have saved a vast number of hard-pressed students many a useless visit to a library. And in all the very many reviews of Förster's which I have read I do not recall a single phrase which struck me as unfair or ungracious! With all this his reviews, of course, form but a subordinate part of his contributions to scholarship, but I for one heartily welcome them. May he long be spared to add to this number.

R. B. McK.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. XXXIII., No. 3, June 1941—

Catholic and protestant drama (Clifford Leech), pp. 171-87.

On the light thrown on Elizabethan drama by the dominant types of seventeenth-century Spanish plays.

The principle of uniformity in English metre (J. Redwood Anderson), pp. 188-200.

Hazlitt's contribution to literary criticism (W. R. Niblett), pp. 211-22.

LIBRARY, Vol. XXI., Nos. 3-4, December 1940-March 1941—

A list of the writings of Ronald Brunlees McKerrow (F. C. Francis), pp. 229-63.

The Churl and the Bird and The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers: two notes (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 279-90.

On the order of Caxton editions.

Christopher Smart in the Magazines (Robert E. Brittain), pp. 320-36.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LVI., No. 4, April 1941—

Versions by Skelton, Caxton, and Berners of a Prologue by Diodorus Siculus (Samuel K. Workman), pp. 252-8.

A metrical puzzle in the *Mirror for Magistrates* (William Peery), pp. 258-61.

The Elizabethan idea of melancholy (Sidney Thomas), pp. 261-3.

Cyme, a purgative drug (Frank Sullivan), pp. 263-4.

On *Macbeth*, V. iii. 55 and *sium* (wild parsley).

Some unpublished verses by Thomas Randolph (Rhodes Dunlap), pp. 264-8.

Thomas Carew, Thomas Carey, and 'The Sovereign of the Seas' (Rhodes Dunlap), pp. 268-71.

Evidence for the authorship of Thomas Carey of Tower Hill.

Burton, Bacon, and Sandys (Robert R. Cawley), pp. 271-3.

On the indebtedness of Burton and Bacon to a passage in George Sandys's *Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610*.

A borrowing from Spenser by Phineas Fletcher (Bain Tate Stewart), pp. 273-4.

The burning of Milton's *Defensio* in France (J. Milton French), pp. 275-7.

Milton's Callimachus (Nathan Dane II), pp. 278-9.

A note on Blair's edition of *The Unhappy Favourite* (R. M. Lumiansky), pp. 280-2.

The 'closet' and the 'stage' in 1759 (Stephen A. Larrabee), pp. 282-4.

A Dublin Milton enthusiast (Russell K. Alspach), pp. 284-6.

On Samuel Whyte (1733-1811).

'Gill Morice' in the *Reliques* again (Leah Dennis), pp. 286-8.

Moses Browne and the 1783 edition of Giles and Phineas Fletcher (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 288-90.

On the serial publication of *Oliver Twist* (Gerald Giles Grubb), pp. 290-4.

Ivanhoe and Simms' *Vasconcelos* (Raven I. McDavid, Jr.), pp. 294-7.

— No. 5, May 1941—

The dark hints of Sir John Hawkins and Boswell (Frederick A. Pottle), pp. 325-9.

A propos de 'Nathaniel Hawthorne en France' (Fernand Baldensperger), pp. 343-5.

Sir John Paston's *Grete Booke*, a fifteenth-century 'best-seller' (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 345-51.

Astrological prognostications in MS. 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 351-5.

Hygd (Kemp Malone), pp. 356-8.

A restored reading in the Towneley Purification Play (Edward Murray Clark), pp. 358-60.

Lilburne's note on Milton (Don M. Wolfe), pp. 360-3.

On a passage in *As You Were* (1652).

Izaak Walton a stationer? (Arthur M. Coon), pp. 363-6.

John Donne's 'Bracelet of bright hair about the bone' (Phillips D. Carleton), pp. 366-8.

A misdating of 'A ballade upon a wedding' (Carl Niemeyer), pp. 368-9.

The Jonsonian tradition in the comedies of John Dennis (C. B. Graham), pp. 370-2.

Rochester's 'buffoon conceit' (J. Harold Wilson), pp. 372-3.

The Character in the Elia Essays (Varley Lang), pp. 374-6.

Coleridge's Mount Abora (Henry Pettit), p. 376.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXVI., No. 2, April 1941—

Some lost saints' lives in Old and Middle English (R. M. Wilson), pp. 161-72.

Did Shakespeare produce his own plays? (Alfred Hart), pp. 173-83.

The *Autobiography* of Edward, first Lord Herbert of Cherbury: the original manuscript material (R. I. Aaron), pp. 184-94.

On linguistic explanation (Manfred Sandmann), pp. 195-212.

Balzac and Thackeray (W. C. D. Pacey), pp. 213-24.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 381

A newly-discovered manuscript of the C-Text of *Piers Plowman* (A. G. Mitchell), pp. 243-4.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 180, April 5, 1941—

Nicholas Breton's *Honest Counsaile* (Jean Robertson), pp. 236-7.

Figures of speech (Jane Green), p. 238.

Continued May 17, pp. 349-50; May 24, pp. 368-9.

Some Spenser problems (Douglas Hamer), pp. 238-41.

Replies from W. H. Weply, April 5, p. 248; from E. G. W., April 26, p. 304.

— April 12—

The birth and parentage of William Combe (Franz Montgomery), pp. 254-7.

Thomas Coxeter the Younger to Dr. Johnson (James L. Clifford), pp. 257-8.

An unpublished letter of April 23, 1771.

Michaelmas goose (R. W. Chapman), p. 258.

Corrigendum to a note in Jane Austen's *Letters*.

Milton's use of Phineas Fletcher's *Purple Island* (Sara Ruth Watson), p. 258.

Hamlet: 'pajock' (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 258-9.

— April 19—

James Hogg's the *Spy*, 1810-1811 (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 272-6.

Julius Caesar and the Duke of Guise (M. Hope Dodds), pp. 276-9.

A jeu d'esprit with a lesson for disintegrators.

— April 26—

The Cumberland ancestry of John Dryden (P. D. Mundy), pp. 290-1.

John Chapman (Sydney Race), pp. 293-5.

Supplementary to G. S. Haight's *George Eliot and John Chapman*. Concluded May 17, pp. 347-9.

— May 3—

Some notes on the Twickenham *Pope* (George G. Loane), pp. 311-3.

Reply from B. H. Newdigate, May 17, p. 357; from Geoffrey Tillotson, June 14, p. 427.

Notes on Milton (E. H. Visiak), pp. 313, 316.

— May 10—

Haydon's letter arranging for Keats to meet Wordsworth (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 328-9.

An unpublished letter.

Notes on the *Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb* (E.G.B.), pp. 329-32.

Reply from E. H. V., May 24, p. 377.

The Georgics of Bacchicles: an anonymous poem on tobacco: authorship (C. W. Brodribb), p. 332.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 180, May 17—

Thomson's subscription *Seasons* (John Edwin Wells), p. 350.

Actors' parts and Elizabethan play-texts (H. W. Crundell), pp. 350-1.

———— May 31—

Shakespeare and Gower (Richard Hussey), p. 386.

Parallel passages (Sonnet 64 and *Vox Clamantis*).

———— June 7—

Mourners at Sir Philip Sidney's funeral (B. H. Newdigate), pp. 398-401.

Reply from W. Gurney Benham, June 21, pp. 444-5.

Herman Melville: a new source? (William White), p. 403.

On *Moby-Dick* and L. A. Baker's *Harry Martingale* (1848).

Collins's 'Young Damon of the vale is dead' (P. L. Carver), pp. 407-8.

Cf. *N. & Q.*, Vol. 178, p. 193.

———— June 14—

Thomas Drant's definition of satire, 1566 (Mary Claire Randolph), pp. 416-9.

———— June 21—

Some Spenser problems: being a reply to Mr. Douglas Hamer's articles (W. H. Welpy), pp. 436-9.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 2, April 1941—

The medical concept in English renaissance satiric theory: its possible relationships and implications (Mary Claire Randolph), pp. 125-57.

The two matters: classical and christian in the renaissance (Arnold Williams), pp. 158-64.

Renaissance remedies for fortune: Marlowe and the *fortunati* (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 188-97.

Spenser and the serpent of division (William R. Orwen), pp. 198-210.

George Whetstone, Peter Beverly, and the sources of *Much Ado about Nothing* (C. T. Prouty), pp. 211-20.

The theme of damnation in Shakespearean tragedy (Kenneth O. Myrick), pp. 221-45.

Milton and Moses Bar-Cepha (Grant McColley), pp. 246-51.

Milton's use of 'begot' in *Paradise Lost*, V. 603 (Maurice Kelley), pp. 252-65.

The causeway from Hell to the World in the tenth book of *Paradise Lost* (E. M. W. Tillyard), pp. 266-70.

Recent literature of the renaissance (edited by Hardin Craig), pp. 271-426.

A bibliography.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 5, 1941—

A Gothic Bibliography (Montague Summers), p. 165.

Reply from Alec Craig, April 19, p. 191; from Montague Summers, May 24, p. 251.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

Drury Lane Diaries (M. Willson Disher), p. 172.

On the four recovered diaries (1803-16, 1820-2, 1823-6 and 1827-30) of Winston. Continued April 12, p. 184; April 19, p. 195; concluded April 26, p. 208.

William Blake (Ruthven Todd), p. 172.

Request for letters written to the Gilchris concerning Blake.

A Chatterton edition (P. H. Muir), p. 172.

On the *Execution of Sir Charles Bateman* (1772).

— April 12—

A line in Keats (H. W. Garrod), p. 179.

Cf. *T.L.S.*, March 8, p. 117, and March 29, p. 151. Reply from E. H. W. Meyerstein, April 19, p. 191; from Robert W. Cruttwell and from R. W. King, May 3, p. 215.

— April 19—

The quest for Faithful Teate (S. C. Roberts), p. 196.

Cf. *T.L.S.*, January 18, p. 36, and January 25, p. 48.

— April 26—

'The sole Arabian tree' (Osbert Sitwell), pp. 199, 206.

Replies from Malcolm Letts and from C. H. Wilkinson, May 3, pp. 215, 216; from Margaret Cooper, May 24, p. 251; from T. W. Baldwin, June 14, p. 287. Cf. also April 26, p. 203.

Elizabethan plays in Germany (Anon.), p. 208.

On Friederich Manius as editor of *Englische Comedien und Tragedien*, 1620. Corrigenda May 3, p. 220.

— May 3—

More Scott Marginalia (W. M. Parker), p. 220.

Continued May 10, p. 232; concluded May 17, p. 244.

— May 17—

A neglected correction in Milton (C. W. Brodribb), pp. 239, 241.

On *Paradise Regained*, IV. 157-8.

— May 24—

A Henry James essay (Leon Edel), pp. 251, 253.

— May 31—

Andrew Lang bibliography (Roger Lancelyn Green), p. 263.

Enquiry concerning the present whereabouts of C. M. Falconer's MS. bibliography of Andrew Lang.

Thomas Barnes (Derek Hudson), p. 263.

Request for fresh information, letters, etc., for a biography of *The Times* journalist.

— June 7—

A note on Otway (Montague Summers), p. 275.

On Aquilina in *Venice Preserv'd*.

The Cleek'um Inn (Bruce Dickins), p. 275.

Enquiry concerning the connection between certain place names and the Cleek'um Inn of *St. Ronan's Well*.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 14—

Sidney's *Apology* (E. M. W. Tillyard), pp. 287, 290.

— June 21—

'Sit' versus 'fit' (C. T. Onions), p. 299.

On *Cymbeline*, IV. ii. 384.

Trollope's *American Senator* (R. W. Chapman), p. 304.

— June 28—

Songs in Lyly's plays (M. Hope Dodds), p. 311.

Chatterton's last days (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 316.

